American Planning and Civic Annual

352 A5 1944

Kansas City
Public Library

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

This Volume is for

REFERENCE USE ONLY

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO

From the collection of the



San Francisco, California
2006

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO

AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO



Above:

J. Horace McFarland, President, American Civic Association, 1904–1925



Above:

Frederic A. Delano, President, American Planning and Civic Association, 1925–1937 Chairman of the Board of Directors, 1937–



Right:

Horace M. Albright, President, American Planning and Civic Association, 1937–





Above:

First Vice-President, Maj. Gen. U.S. Grant, 3rd Washington, D. C.



Above:

Second Vice-President, Tom Wallace, Louisville, Kentucky

Right:

Third Vice-President, Earle S. Draper, Washington, D. C.

Vice-Presidents

American Planning and Civic Association

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO

AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL

A RECORD OF RECENT CIVIC ADVANCE IN THE FIELDS OF PLANNING, PARKS, HOUSING, NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENT AND CONSERVATION OF NATIONAL RESOURCES, INCLUDING THE ADDRESSES DELIVERED AT THE CITIZENS CONFERENCE ON PLANNING, HELD ON THE FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ORGANIZATION OF THE AMERICAN CIVIC ASSOCIATION AT SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI, ON JUNE 14, 15, 16, 1944

EDITED BY
HARLEAN JAMES

AMERICAN PLANNING AND
CIVIC ASSOCIATION
901 UNION TRUST BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

1944

PUBLIC LIBRARY
KANSAS CITY
MO

THE AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL is sent to all paid members and subscribers of the American Planning and Civic Association and the National Conference on State Parks, who may purchase extra copies for $2 each.

The public may purchase past American Planning and Civic Annuals and the current Annual for $3 each.

A complete set of the American Planning and Civic Annuals (10 vols. 1935–1944) may be purchased for $15.

Copyright 1945
By American Planning and Civic Association

Mount Pleasant Press
J. Horace McFarland Company
Harrisburg, Pa.

Reference
352
A5
1944

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION PAGE

*Forty Years of Civic Planning *Horace M. Albright* ix
*Messages from Dr. J. Horace McFarland, Vance McCormick and Richard Watrous xvi

THE NATION

National Resources

*Why Have Floods? *Louis Bromfield* 1
*The Soil Conservation District as a Democratic Institution for Conservation of Agricultural Resources *H. P. Rusk* 7
*Will Returning Soldiers Seek the Land? *O. R. Johnson* 13
*Conservation Faces Postwar Dangers *Tom Wallace* 19
"Land Grabbers" *Newton B. Drury* 22
President Roosevelt Vetoes the Bill to Abolish Jackson Hole National Monument *Franklin D. Roosevelt* 28

Postwar Policy

*Postwar Employment by Business . . . *Frederick C. Crawford* 31
Postwar Public Works *Philip B. Fleming* 40
*Highways—A New National Program *H. S. Fairbank* 44
*Urban Redevelopment Legislation *Alfred Bettman* 51
*Postwar Municipal Finance in the National Economy *Walter W. Heller* 61

Housing

*Housing: What Private Enterprise Can Do . *Thomas S. Holden* 72
*Housing: Public Responsibility *John Ihlder* 80
The Federal Public Housing Authority in 1944 *Philip Klutznick* 86

Federal City

*Planning and Parks in the Federal City *U. S. Grant, 3rd.* 91

IN THE STATES

State Park Review 97

IN THE CITIES AND TOWNS

*Saint Louis, a Planned City *A. P. Kaufmann* 111
*The Saint Louis Plan in Action *Harland Bartholomew* 112

The Modern City

*Introduction *Chester C. Davis*
*Improved Methods for Building Better Cities *J. Woodall Rodgers* 117
*Metropolitan Cities in the Postwar Period . . . *Malcolm H. Dill* 125
*A Modern City's Transportation Needs *Charles Gordon* 130
*Coördination of Railroad Terminals *Frank G. Jonah* 137
*Effect of Air Travel on Metropolitan Regions . . *Oliver L. Parks* 145
*"The People's Parks" *Robert M. Evans* 146

Mem'l.
1168374
APR 20 1945

CONTENTS

Postwar Plans and Citizens Support		PAGE
*The Plan, The Press and the Citizen	*Stephen C. Noland*	151
*Applied Plans as seen in Syracuse	*Guy Greer*	156
*Postwar Planning for Democracy in Cleveland	*S. Burns Weston*	163
*Postwar Programs and Citizen Support in Detroit	*Edward Connor*	168
*Postwar Program and Citizen Support—Niagara Frontier	*Bertram C. Tallamy*	171

*An asterisk means that the paper was presented at the Citizens Conference on Planning, held in Saint Louis, June 14, 15 and 16, 1944.

Editor's Note.—On January 21, 1945, Mr. Alfred Bettman died suddenly, but, before his death, 1,000 preprints of the article listed in these Contents had been circulated in response to the demand for his paper.

AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION

OFFICERS AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Chairman of the Board . . Frederic A. Delano, Washington, D. C.
President Horace M. Albright, New York City
First Vice-President U. S. Grant, 3rd, Washington, D. C.
Second Vice-President . . Tom Wallace, Louisville, Ky.
Third Vice-President Earle S. Draper, Washington, D. C.
Treasurer C. F. Jacobsen, Washington, D. C.
Executive Secretary Harlean James, Washington, D. C.
Counsel Flavel Shurtleff, New York City
Librarian Mrs. Dora A. Padgett, Washington, D. C.

Harland Bartholomew, St. Louis, Mo.
Edward M. Bassett, New York City
Harold S. Buttenheim, New York City
Henry P. Chandler, Washington, D. C.
Gilmore D. Clarke, Ithaca, N. Y.
Miss H. M. Dermitt, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Jay Downer, New York City
Philip H. Elwood, Ames, Iowa
John M. Gries, Conover, Ohio
Byron Harvey, Jr., Chicago, Ill.
Elisabeth M. Herlihy, Boston, Mass.
Henry V. Hubbard, Brookline, Mass.
B. H. Kizer, Spokane, Wash.
Frank M. Lindsay, Decatur, Ill.
J. Horace McFarland, Harrisburg, Pa.
J. C. Nichols, Kansas City, Mo.
J. Woodall Rodgers, Dallas, Tex.
L. Deming Tilton, San Francisco, Calif.
Samuel P. Wetherill, Philadelphia, Pa.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mrs. Henry A. Barker, Providence, R. I.
Mrs. Edward W. Biddle, Philadelphia, Pa.
Carey H. Brown, Rochester, N. Y.
Struthers Burt, Southern Pines, N. C.
Harold A. Caparn, New York City
Victor M. Cutter, Boston, Mass.
Jay N. Darling, Des Moines, Iowa
George B. Dealey, Dallas, Texas
Francis P. Farquhar, San Francisco, Calif.
J. P. Fishburn, Roanoke, Va.
A. P. Giannini, San Francisco, Calif.
Edwin C. Graham, Washington, D. C.
William C. Gregg, Hackensack, N. J.
Chauncey J. Hamlin, Buffalo, N. Y.
James M. Langley, Concord, N. H.
Charles F. Lewis, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Thomas H. MacDonald, Washington, D. C.
Vance C. McCormick, Harrisburg, Pa.
Henry T. McIntosh, Albany, Ga.
Mrs. Junius S. Morgan, Princeton, N. J.
Crispin Oglebay, Gates Mills, Ohio
Frederick Law Olmsted, Brookline, Mass.
Lawson Purdy, New York City
George L. Radcliffe, Baltimore, Md.
Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Washington, D. C.
William H. Schuchardt, Los Angeles, Calif.
Albert Shaw, Hastings-on-the-Hudson, N. Y.
A. D. Taylor, Cleveland, Ohio
Mrs. A. L. Thurman, Washington, Conn.
Richard B. Watrous, Northampton, Mass.
M. L. Wilson, Washington, D. C.
Clinton Rogers Woodruff, Philadelphia, Pa.
Baldwin M. Woods, Berkeley, Calif.
George F. Yantis, Olympia, Wash.

HEADQUARTERS

901 Union Trust Building, Washington 5, D. C.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON STATE PARKS

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President Harold W. Lathrop, Minnesota
First Vice-President....Thomas W. Morse, North Carolina
Second Vice-President ..James F. Evans, New York
Treasurer C. F. Jacobsen, District of Columbia
Executive Secretary Harlean James, District of Columbia

Horace M. Albright, New York
J. L. Babler, Missouri
Mrs. Edmund B. Ball, Indiana
Howard B. Bloomer, Michigan
Sam F. Brewster, Alabama
Paul V. Brown, Indiana
Laurie D. Cox, New York
S. G. Davies, Arkansas
Charles A. DeTurk, Indiana
Charles N. Elliott, Georgia
Mrs. Henry Frankel, Iowa
Carter Jenkins, Illinois
Robert Kingery, Illinois
Herbert Maier, California
Frank D. Quinn, Texas
Charles G. Sauers, Illinois
Harold S. Wagner, Ohio
Tom Wallace, Kentucky
Conrad L. Wirth, Illinois

The two organizations join in the publication of

THE AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL
and the
QUARTERLY, PLANNING AND CIVIC COMMENT

The purpose of the American Planning and Civic Association is the education of the American people to an understanding and appreciation of: local, state, regional and national planning for the best use of urban and rural land, and of water and of other natural resources; the safeguarding and planned use of local and national parks; the conservation of natural scenery; the advancement of higher ideals of life and civic beauty in America; the improvement of living conditions and the fostering of wider educational facilities in schools and colleges along these lines.

The purpose of the National Conference on State Parks is to inform the public through a central clearing house of information, publications, conferences, courses of training in schools and colleges, and by other educational means, of the value of state parks, historic sites, forests and preserves, suitable for recreation, study of natural history and science, preservation of wildlife and conservation of natural scenery, by the development within the States of well-balanced state park systems; to the end that every citizen of the United States shall have easy access to state recreation areas and appreciate their value as a recognized form of land use.

INTRODUCTION

Forty Years of Civic Planning

HORACE M. ALBRIGHT
President, American Planning and Civic Association, New York City

FORTY years ago, at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition held in Saint Louis in 1904, the American Civic Association was organized as a merger of the American Park and Outdoor Art Society, which had been created in Louisville, Kentucky in 1897, and the American League for Civic Improvement, which had started in Springfield, Ohio in 1901. I may add that the American Civic Association continued from 1904 until 1935 under that name, but that it then merged with the National Conference on City Planning to form the American Planning and Civic Association of today.

Early Programs

I have been looking over a program of the first annual meeting of the American Civic Association which was held in Cleveland in 1905. We can form a very good idea of what was going on in the minds of the members in those days by the subjects of the talks given at the conference. Foremost on the list we find Home Gardening, Children's Gardens, Playgrounds and Public Recreation. We find Civic and Neighborhood Improvement, Schools and Libraries as Civic Centers. There were speakers on Improvement in the Surroundings of Industrial Establishments, and, interestingly enough, we find a presentation of the program for improving Washington in line with the McMillan Report of 1901. City Plans and Outer Park Systems, City Land Values and Parks, Railroads and Rural Improvement and lastly the Good Roads Movement all found places on the program.

As we contemplate the accomplishments in all of these lines we can feel a sense of gratification that we were pioneers; but when we think also of what remains to be done we know that we can still work in a spirit of humility for the great gains we have yet to win.

Decade—1900–1910

Perhaps it will not be amiss to recall that during the first decade of the twentieth century, we were groping toward a broad conception of city planning but we did not yet comprehend the full opportunities which were to be ours. Let me remind you that in 1904, the George Kessler Report for the Kingshighway Commission of Saint Louis was only one year old; that none of the many planning reports which appeared before 1910 had been published. The famous Report on the Chicago Plan was not issued until 1908. It was in 1910 that George Kessler reported on the

City Plan for Dallas. Most of these reports proposed embellishments to be superimposed upon the existing structure. Outside of street widenings (which often proved futile or inadequate), creation of civic centers for sites of public buildings, development of neglected river fronts, and the expansion of park systems, it was assumed that we must abide by the plan or lack of plan which most cities had inherited from the chaotic past.

Years must elapse between the making of plans and their full realization. The skeptics of 1908 could not look thirty or forty years ahead into the future and see the magnificent outer parkways and the complete revolution of Chicago's Lake front. Moreover, most of the casual visitors who ride along these scenic parkways have little conception of the daring plans of 1908 which made them possible.

The ideas which led to the organization of the American Civic Association in 1904 paved the way for the preparation of these many planning reports, generally at the instance of local civic organizations. As progress was achieved and planning commissions came into existence, the reports came to be directed to municipal officials and legislative bodies.

In the field of Conservation, we may recall that it was not until 1908 that President Theodore Roosevelt called that historic Conference of Governors to consider the Land, Mineral and Water Resources of the Nation.

In 1904 there were but six important National Parks and we had no central national park agency in the Federal Government. It was not until late in the second decade of the century that the National Park Service was created, largely as the result of the intensive educational leadership of the American Civic Association. The Service was actually organized in 1917, just as we entered the War.

Decade—1910–1920

The years from 1910–1920 brought many changes and some new ideas. The congestion of cities had already begun to worry civic leaders. Though the actual organization of the National Conference on City Planning fell in 1909, its first annual meeting and its pioneer work came within the decade from 1910 to 1920. The various reports of the Heights of Buildings Commission of New York, issued from 1913 to 1916 led directly to the early zoning laws which had to encounter traditional resistances on the part of individual property owners. It was only when it became apparent that unrestricted development had the power to injure nearby real estate that property owners realized that they must adopt some rules which would preserve their enjoyment in their homes and stabilize property values. All this did not occur until long after 1920, but if it had not been for the pioneer study and initiative of those early years, we would not today be living in zoned cities. Whatever may be said of zoning, we shall have to admit that its failures have been due to inadequate laws, poorly enforced, and not to inherent weaknesses of the conception.

Decade—1920–1930

The decade of 1920–30, following the first World War, brought a great multiplication in Planning Commissions and Zoning agencies. It was in 1922 that the American Civic Association organized its Committee of 100 on the Federal City, with 75 field Committees, in order to give support to a movement to create a planning agency for the Nation's Capital. This finally took place in 1926, when the Act of Congress gave us the existing Commission.

The Great Depression

From the organization of the American Civic Association to the birth of the Great Depression, a quarter of a century had elapsed. During all that time, the public-spirited citizens who had banded together in the Association, labored in season and out of season to bring about better physical environment for the American people. New governmental agencies were fostered and supported. Attacks on national parks were resisted—nearly always with success. Encroachments on city parks were opposed. Departures from official plans were fought in many cities of the country by those who received their information and their inspiration from the programs of the American Civic Association.

In the early days of the Depression came the National Planning Committee, as an adjunct of the Public Works Program, which later became the National Resources Planning Board, a logical development from the first Conference of Governors called by Theodore Roosevelt. No one who has studied historical movements can doubt that ultimately, and perhaps at not too distant a date, a new National Planning Board of some sort will be created to carry on a clearing house and service organization for the many local, state and Federal independent plans which are bound to become increasingly conflicting.

Fifth Decade of the 20th Century

And now, as we are well advanced into the fifth decade of the century, we have become involved in a world-wide struggle to preserve the fine initiative and the independence of thought and action which have made possible our national existence and which have given us a land to love and defend.

Postwar Planning

As the American Planning and Civic Association faces the postwar period, which may come upon us so gradually that we hardly realize that we are out of the war and working again for well-planned communities and general conservation of our resources, we must realize that there are new problems before us.

Our cities have suffered from dry rot from within which cannot be cured by patent medicines or temporizing measures. We are all thinking of ways and means for redeeming these blighted or deteriorating areas

in the center of our cities. We know now only too well that we cannot accomplish this, building by building or block by block. We are in a position to profit by the application of modern planning principles to areas sufficiently large to be used as self-contained districts or neighborhoods. This neighborhood-unit idea is not new; but so far we have not had the courage to replace extensive districts with changed uses and new plans.

Our rural communities have made relatively better progress in land-use studies during recent years than our cities, thanks to the excellent Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture and the growing Soil Conservation Districts organized on a democratic basis.

In the preservation of our national parks and monuments from unwise commercial encroachments we may encounter some difficulties, for, curiously enough, we were inclined to believe that the educated public and the leaders in Congress who in the last generation came to the rescue of these precious possessions, would always be there to call upon. We now find that we have a new generation which does not always recognize the threats to these national parks and monuments preserved in the past because of a militant public opinion. Sweet reasonableness sometimes leads the inexperienced to think that compromise may be the most comfortable answer. They forget that natural scenery is no longer natural scenery when it is subjected to power reservoirs, mining operations, grazing of domestic live stock, or other objectionable uses.

Our program for 1945 includes continued public education which will resist the attacks now being made on Jackson Hole National Monument, and the general assault on national parks and monuments which would remove great areas for private commercial uses. In the Federal City we are marshaling our forces to fight against development of power on the Potomac in the vicinity of Washington, where a natural river setting of unparalleled beauty has been miraculously preserved through all these years. In the Federal City, which we believe can be made an exemplar for applied city planning, we are coöperating with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission to bring about certain reforms in the way of set-up, but more particularly for legislation which will permit redevelopment of the large blighted districts allowing coöperative private-enterprise and public-housing programs to meet the needs of congested Washington.

Publications

Through our Annual and our quarterly, Planning and Civic Comment, we endeavor to keep our members and readers abreast of the times in these important subjects of conservation and planning. We offer every member a fighting program for the home community and a nation-wide hook-up for advancing planning and conservation on a national scale.

Civic Leaders

So much for the changes which have come to the United States during the past forty years. I could not close without making specific reference to the men and women who have participated in bringing about many of these changes. Advances do not come by reading alone. They come through the dynamic efforts of human beings. And the results are much more effective when these human beings study before they act and then act in the light of well-considered knowledge.

At the time of the organization meeting held in Saint Louis forty years ago, Dr. J. Horace McFarland, of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, was made President of the new association. Dr. McFarland is still active in good works and intellectual leadership after forty years, but, being now in his 85th year, has had to be content with sending us a message of good cheer instead of coming in person as he has so many times in the past. Dr. McFarland for more than twenty years was the spearhead of all the bitter fights which the Association felt bound to wage. It was Dr. McFarland who held the torch for the preservation of Niagara Falls and it was his unremitting energy which led to the adoption of the Burton Bill and the subsequent Treaty between the United States and Canada. It was Dr. McFarland who threw himself headlong into the fight against Hetch-Hetchy—the only major fight which the American Civic Association ever lost, and the losing of which most certainly ended prematurely the life of that great conservation leader, John Muir. It was Dr. McFarland who year after year came over to Washington to help defend Yellowstone National Park from the proposed irrigation, power and other invasions. It was Dr. McFarland who, with the then Governor Charles Evans Hughes and Dr. George F. Kunz, raised his voice at the Governors' Conference of 1908 for the preservation of natural beauty in America. It was Dr. McFarland who worked indefatigably in Congress after Congress for the creation of the National Park Service. In all of these great national services he was ably aided by Frederick Law Olmsted, who is still active in the planning and landscape fields, by Dr. Charles S. Sargent of the Arnold Arboretum, by George Foster Peabody, Franklin MacVeagh and Vance McCormick.

In addition to all of these national services, Dr. McFarland in the twenty-one years of his Presidency, visited personally more than 300 cities and towns. He showed lantern slides. He stimulated the citizens to action. Mr. George B. Dealey of Dallas, Texas, who was early active in the Association, persuaded him to come to Dallas to stir up the citizens in the movement which led to the employment of Mr. George E. Kessler for making the first plan of Dallas. You will hear more of the present comprehensive planning going on in that progressive city of the Southwest. Dr. McFarland and Vance McCormick were partners in the local movement which led to the improvement of the Waterfront of Harrisburg, which may be seen by all travelers who cross the Susquehanna there.

When Dr. McFarland retired from the Presidency, but not from active participation in the affairs of the Association or from civic leadership in his home city and State, the task was taken up by Mr. Frederic A. Delano, who had been for three years Chairman of the Association's Committee of 100 on the Federal City, and who is still Chairman of the Board. Mr. Delano had been associated with the Chicago Plan, had been Chairman of the Plan of New York and its Environs, and was to become Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and of the National Resources Planning Board. By his sane judgments, his rich experience and his unflagging energy and devotion, Mr. Delano gave to the Nation and to the Federal City a leadership which has brought about signal advances and without which Washington would today be much less able to meet the burden of its huge wartime population.

Even a condensed list of the names of those who have aided in bringing about the civic improvements and conservation advances of the last forty years reads like a roster of the civic great of the Twentieth Century. They are the leaders of their generation. From the beginning, succeeding Presidents have made addresses, sent messages and from the White House given impetus to many of the national projects fostered by the Association—Presidents Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and Franklin D. Roosevelt—we might say from Roosevelt to Roosevelt. Among the many who have made addresses at meetings, served on the Board and otherwise assisted the Association are Right Honorable James Bryce, Ambassador of Great Britain to the United States, Ambassador Jules J. Jusserand of France, Theodore Burton, First Senator and then Representative from Ohio, Thomas Adams, Henry A. Barker, Harland Bartholomew, Edward M. Bassett, Mrs. Edward Biddle, Louis Bromfield, Daniel H. Burnham, Struthers Burt, Hermon C. Bumpus, Marshall Dana, "Ding" Darling, George B. Dealey, Miss H. M. Dermitt, Earle S. Draper, Henry S. Drinker, Harold W. Dodd, William Dudley Foulke, George B. Ford, Zona Gale, A. P. Giannini, Abram Garfield, John M. Glenn, William C. Gregg, Carl Gould, John M. Gries, Chauncey J. Hamlin, Albert Bushnell Hart, Elisabeth Herlihy, William B. Howland, Henry V. Hubbard, Morton D. Hull, John Ihlder, Mayor Tom Johnson, Harlan P. Kelsey, George E. Kessler, Ben H. Kizer, Morris Knowles, Joseph Lee, Nelson P. Lewis, Richard Lieber, Frank Lindsay, John Nolen, Warren H. Manning, Stephen T. Mather, William G. Mather, Franklin MacVeagh, Vance McCormick, Frederick Law Olmsted, John Barton Payne, George Foster Peabody, Lawson Purdy, Nicholas Roosevelt, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Charles S. Sargent, Albert Shaw, Lorado Taft, Graham Romeyn Taylor, L. Deming Tilton, Charles Wacker, Frank A. Waugh, Robert Whitten, Charles Zueblin, and many others. The Civic Association from 1904 to 1935 was served by five Secretaries—Charles Mulford Robinson, Clinton Rogers Woodruff, Richard B. Watrous, Eleanor Thurman and Harlean James.

The National Conference on City Planning from its organization in Washington in 1909, held twenty-seven national conferences in different cities of the United States, including meetings in Saint Louis in 1918 and 1934. First as Chairman of the Executive Committee and later as President, Frederick Law Olmsted served the Conference for the first ten years of its existence. After that came in succession: Nelson P. Lewis, Lawson Purdy, George B. Ford, John Nolen, Edward M. Bassett, Harland Bartholomew and Alfred Bettman. The Proceedings issued during these years constitute an authoritative history of the modern planning movement in the United States.

The Conference from 1909 until its merger in 1935 was served by Flavel Shurtleff, who, since then has acted as Counsel to the American Planning and Civic Association. Harlean James is now Executive Secretary of the merger Association. Since 1935 the Proceedings of the Joint Planning Conferences and since 1942 of the American Planning and Civic Association have appeared in the AMERICAN PLANNING AND CIVIC ANNUAL.

SAINT LOUIS CONFERENCES

It is a curious fact that the American Civic Association, born in Saint Louis, held its World War Conference of 1917 in Saint Louis and I note with interest that three of the Saint Louis Arrangements Committee of that time are again on the Committee in 1944—Mr. E. J. Russell, Mr. Lionberger Davis and Mrs. George Gellhorn. Incidentally the subject of that Conference was Civic Advance in War Times.

By the time that the American Civic Association came to Saint Louis again in the year 1934 it was in a joint Conference with the National Conference on City Planning and the following year the two organizations merged to form the American Planning and Civic Association which is meeting here today.

I am glad to say that when Mr. Delano persuaded me to take the Presidency in 1937 he remained as Chairman of the Board. I have been fortunate that I have been able to count always on the advice, counsel, and active support of Dr. McFarland, our first President, and Mr. Delano, our second President.

To Mayor Kaufmann, Mr. Bartholomew, Mrs. Gellhorn, Mr. Lionberger Davis, Mr. Lawrence and Mr. Landau who have served as busy officers of the Sponsoring Saint Louis Committee for this Conference, and to the many chairmen and aides who are making it possible for the Association to meet in comfort and convenience, I pay tribute. Let us hope that out of this second war conference which we have held in Saint Louis will come inspiration for achievement in city, State and Nation for the planned use of our natural resources and the provision of community environment worthy of American citizens.

The First President Reports

DR. J. HORACE McFARLAND, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

NOT one of those who gathered at Saint Louis forty years ago to discuss civic betterment and park development had any idea as to what he might be starting. Because it seemed worth while, an arrangement had been made to have the annual meetings of two betterment organizations coincidentally. Charles Zueblin, who had fathered the American League for Civic Improvement, and Warren H. Manning, who had not only fathered but mothered the American Park and Outdoor Art Society, believed the time had come when more could be done with one organization than with two. So it came out. As I see it now, the gathering comprehended a group of human matches ready to be struck. There were no particular resources to worry about, save a debt on one organization—if that is a resource! There was a history of high endeavor. American towns were to be made better places to live in, the United States was to have local, state and national parks, if this group could think them through. Saint Louis was glad to see us, because its political-minded park commissioner showed us what he had been concerned in and with, and wound up a long day by saying: "You folks have something I don't understand, but I'm going to get some of it," and he did.

It would be futile at this time to attempt to catalogue what happened in consequence of the formation of the American Civic Association through the combination of the two organizations mentioned. Matches were struck that blazed and kept blazing. Ideals were changed and bettered. I well remember that one of the organizations concerned was primarily engaged in the extermination of mosquitoes.

Certain highlights still blaze brightly as I think over them. Scarcely a year later, at the first annual meeting in Cleveland, in 1905, we began to talk Niagara, and we exploded toward Washington and toward Ottawa. I still remember the postcard I received from one Canadian who indignantly rebuked me for having assumed that the English Government had anything to do with Niagara! Much more definitely do I remember what happened when the first interview was had with "Teddy" Roosevelt, who, after shaking hands, said to me: "Now turn on Niagara!" Niagara *was* turned on nationally, and indeed internationally, so that in 1906 the first Burton Bill was passed, taking charge of the great cataract, or rather taking it away from the State of New York and the Province of Ontario, which had quite liberally either given away outright or sold at trifling possible return more water than flowed over the brink of the great cataract.

The British Minister, then James Bryce, came into the picture as well as the American President, and in 1910 Elihu Root had finished the negotiation of the Waterways Treaty of that year which took possession of the Falls *and retains control even now.*

The Association has never hesitated to go to Congress, or to any official, in promotion of its purposes, and many interesting contacts have occurred. To hold inviolate the Yellowstone, Yosemite and other parks, to prevent the desecration of the Grand Canyon, have been our job, and we have worked at it.

But this is not to be a catalogue of what happened in consequence of that first Saint Louis meeting. It did seem as if America was ready to be stirred up for betterment both in intimate civic matters and in park development. The Niagara procedure was not entirely peaceful, for once when I was delivering an address in the city of Niagara Falls the lights were turned out on me! Nor was the park progress a smooth forward procedure. Through succeeding Administrations, the effort continued, and definite progress was started when, at the beginning of the first Wilson administration, Franklin K. Lane, then Secretary of the Interior, listened to Richard B. Watrous and myself for five minutes, and then said: "*If what you say is true*, then the national parks are being operated about as the two railroads which serve Washington would be if they ran trains between Baltimore and Washington without a dispatcher." So the national park legislation came into existence, and instead of being a football kicked around between Agriculture and Interior and the Army with no central administration, the national parks assumed a parallel position to the national forests.

It was at the first Conference of Governors, called together in May, 1908 by "Teddy" Roosevelt, to start saving some of our national resources, that I was permitted for twelve minutes to sing the song of parks and park beauty, thus presenting one of two papers at that great conference based entirely on æsthetic grounds. The other was presented by Dr. George F. Kunz, President of the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society. I am glad to note also that Governor Charles Evans Hughes of New York outlined the history of conservation in that great State, including the establishment of the Adirondack forest park.

That the matches lighted at Saint Louis kept on burning was evidenced in the demands from various sections of America which took me from Texas to California, from Boston to Denver, in the years when there was some difficulty in finding time in between in which to earn a living. But things happened. The American Civic Association never made the mistake of proposing standard plans, nor did it ever adopt *ringing resolutions*. It did propose always the use of the best available expert advice, and the planners of America, those who had unrealized dreams, joined in the effort. Something over three hundred communities were stirred to do things that would make America a better place to live in. Sometimes it was a woman's club, again it was a group of architects. Always there were those to listen who became concerned about what they needed to do, and got busy trying to do it. Many millions of dollars were spent, not under any dictation of the American Civic Association but because

the experts it promoted showed how money could advantageously be used to better the lives of the citizens.

I send greetings on this fortieth anniversary to those now engaged in this same great work, regretting deeply that getting half way through my ninth decade makes me physically less capable, and prevents me from directly telling about things as I have seen them happen. Very fortunate I have been in my associations. I have been followed by great torch bearers in Frederic A. Delano and Horace M. Albright. Always someone has been ready to help carry on, and so Richard B. Watrous was succeeded by Eleanor Marshall and then by Harlean James, who now continues the work which has taken her across the continent many times, as well as led to continual contacts, and sometimes contests, with legislalators in Washington. As I have said, the American Planning and Civic Association has been fortunate in having successfully avoided the passing of resolutions to do something, only to be forgotten. It has inspired communities all over this fair land which, getting the initial light from the torch first fired here in Saint Louis forty years ago, have gone on. Great men have worked in it and with it and for it, and greater men and women are on the job right now. I greet you all *in absentia*, and extend the hope that another ten years will find the effort going still stronger and for greater advantage to the America we love.

Telegram from Vance C. McCormick

Horace M. Albright, President,
American Planning and Civic Association,
Statler Hotel, Saint Louis, Mo.

With my fellow townsman, Dr. J. Horace McFarland, I saw the American Civic Association within its cradle and thence through the years of its pioneering and achievement in making this Nation civic conscious. Harrisburg is proud of its distinction in having Dr. McFarland head the Association for more than a generation and ever continue as an apostle and crusader of high civic ideals. The United States is a better country because of the American Civic Association and its program.

VANCE C. MCCORMICK

Message from Richard B. Watrous

My introduction to the Association was its convention in Cleveland, in 1905. I was invited to attend the next convention at Providence, R. I., to act as an assistant secretary. Again, the following year, I was asked to give the same assistance at the Pittsburgh convention in the late fall of 1908. There the officers of the Association invited me to become the secretary and give my entire time to furthering its program. I entered upon the duties with headquarters in Harrisburg. A year later the headquarters were moved to Washington.

THE NATION

NATIONAL RESOURCES

Why Have Floods?

LOUIS BROMFIELD, Malabar Farm, Lucas 8, Ohio

IN THE PAST CENTURY hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on rivers and waterways of the United States to prevent floods, and, outside of two or three watersheds, the floods continue. Every year on the Mississippi levees break, houses are swept away, farms buried beneath silt, crops destroyed, and periodically hundreds of human lives are lost. Millions of dollars worth of damage is created, which is suffered by insurance companies, private individuals and by all of us as taxpayers, and the day after the water goes down, we start again to repair levees and dredge channels and begin all over again the senseless operations which do not prevent floods and continue annually to cost us millions.

The spectacle is not very striking evidence of intelligent planning nor of the abilities of the engineers who in the past have been in charge of our flood control. It is like the spectacle of a hill of ants rebuilding their shelter constantly in the middle of a well-travelled road. It is good business for the contractor but for no one else. Essentially we have made very little progress in control of the vast Mississippi since the days when the Spanish put up the first feeble wall to protect the settlement of New Orleans. We are still using the same system, that of building walls on the main trunk or at the mouth of the river to protect farms and cities rather than checking the waters at the source. Perhaps no more vast and grotesque spectacle of putting the cart before the horse has ever occurred in history.

Within the past ten years two or three large-scale flood control enterprises have shown the way toward the proper and effective method of controlling floods. To date these have been 100 percent effective and there is no reason to suppose that they will not continue to be as effective for the rest of time unless we have another forty days of rain like that which Noah encountered. I refer to the great check dams of the Tennessee River watershed and those established in the watersheds of the Muskingum and Miami Rivers in Ohio.

The check dams of the Tennessee River were a part of the vast Tennessee Valley Authority project. Those in Ohio grew out of what was virtually a rebellion on the part of citizens living in the lower reaches of the two Rivers against floods of gradually increasing violence. After the great flood disaster of 1913, which in Ohio caused millions of dollars of damage and devastated big industrial cities like Dayton, Springfield and Zanesville, citizens demanded that something be done—something *sensible* be done—not the construction of high levees which would give way when the flood waters rose above a certain point, not putting the

cart before the horse, but something effective to check the flood waters somewhere near their source, to hold them impounded there until the crisis was finished and then allow them to flow out gradually at a time when, very often, the excess water was actually *needed* by factories and city water supplies.

Only a few far-sighted men understood the problem at the time. There was much opposition to the expenditure of money on a *new* way of checking floods. Most citizens and many engineers talked only in terms of the old-fashioned levees. Much of the opposition came from contractors who made a good thing for over a century out of rebuilding levees and repairing the damage which had become an annual affair.

All along the Muskingum River there exist "twin-towns" which sprang up as a result of increasingly bad floods over a period of a century or more. One was the original settlement made during the pioneer period when the level of the river varied comparatively little the year round. The other town was built later after the frontier was subdued, the forests cut down, the land put under cultivation, and the river level began to vary wildly between disastrous floods in spring and low water in the middle and late summer and autumn. People abandoned houses in the old settlement and built new ones on higher ground, above the flood level. There is in those twin cities a story of great significance, the story of increasingly devastating floods as men cut down the forests and stripped the soil of its natural cover.

In any case, after many years and much discord, the Muskingum Valley Flood Control project was undertaken, partly as a Federal and partly as a state project. Fourteen big dams were constructed at various strategic sites along the tributaries of the Muskingum River. When there was a flooding rainfall or a tremendous thaw of snow and muddy waters began to raise the level of the tributaries, the gates of the check dams were closed and the flood waters impounded to be released gradually at a later period when the reserve water was actually needed for navigation and industrial purposes.

The Army engineers had charge of the construction and behind each dam enough land was taken over to provide space for even more flood water than was encountered during the disastrous record year floods of 1913. From the very beginning the check dams proved effective. No more floods occurred and since then river bottom property values have increased and the older twins of the twin-river cities have been coming back to life. The fourteen dams more than paid for themselves in the damage and loss saved to property owners, farmers and insurance companies in a single bad flood year. There were no levees to break and be repaired year after year only to break again. There was no huge expense to taxpayers. The levees were no longer needed. There is small prospect that the Muskingum River will ever flood its rich valley again, so long as the check dams are kept in order.

In Huntington, West Virginia, on the Ohio River, in the regional headquarters of the Corps of Army Engineers there is a great map and control board which indicates rain and snowfall in every region of the big Muskingum Valley watershed. If there is a great thaw of snow or a flash cloudburst in Wayne or Richland or Ashland Counties, the rainfall and its effect upon the watershed streams is recorded. The level of the water in every check dam of the area, the amount of water it can hold back at a given time is shown. A word by radio and this dam can be closed to shut off flood water or that one opened to release gradually waters already impounded. The whole of the watershed area is always completely in the control of the officer in charge. In his office in Huntington, West Virginia, the officer in charge acts as a kind of weather God. The benefits accrue not only to the citizens of the Muskingum Valley watershed but to property owners and farmers in the Ohio and Mississippi River Valleys, for in flood time the flood waters of the Muskingum watershed no longer add their volume to the already menacing crest of the lower rivers. They are impounded for use later on and so reduce the level of flood waters in the Ohio and the Mississippi.

I have written of the Muskingum project because I live in the watershed area on the borders of one of the beautiful lakes created by the Pleasant Hill Dam and six miles from another called the Charles Mill Dam. I have watched at first hand the operation of these dams and I have seen their effect upon the economic and recreational life of the whole watershed district. Similar systems have *stopped* floods in the TVA watershed of the Tennessee River and in the Miami River in Ohio. Plans are already being carried out for similar control of the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers, which meet at Pittsburgh to form the Ohio River. Once they are completed, disastrous floods at Pittsburgh will become virtually unknown. Gradually, once the headwater check dams are extended along the tributaries of the Ohio, the great River itself will come under the complete control of one man sitting in an office with a control board filling one side of the room.

To those whose thought and experience go beyond the engineering business of constructing dams and barriers, it becomes apparent that even the dams are at best a temporary expedient, effective from varying periods of from fifty to a couple of hundred years. This is so because if proper methods of land use are not employed in the watershed areas above the check dams, every one of them will eventually become filled with silt and their effectiveness in the impounding of waters will gradually become limited and eventually cease altogether as mud fills their basins and occupies entirely the area meant for the storage of flood waters. This silting process is already under way in some of the dams in the Muskingum area.

As heavy rains and the water from melting snow sweep over bare agricultural or deforested land, billions of tons of topsoil, clay and other

materials, are swept into the streams. When the muddy waters of these streams are impounded to stop floods in lower areas, there goes on in each big reservoir a settling process. The impounded water, no longer in motion, drops the silt it contains into the basin of the check dam. The rapidity with which these dams are filling up depends upon the character of the watershed which feeds the dam. In the two Muskingum dams located in Richland County, Ohio, one, the Charles Mill Dam, fed by a headwaters stream called the Black Fork, is silting up rapidly. This is so because the watershed is sparsely wooded and is heavily farmed, and not always too well. Fields are left bare in winter and early spring during the worst flood season, and run-off water is heavily charged with rich silt. Not one farm in twenty in the watershed is farmed properly from the point of view of sound land use, and not one wood lot in ten properly managed to check and hold run-off water. The Black Fork receives its waters from fairly flat land where farmers believe they suffer little erosion, yet, even in times of evenly distributed rainfall, the Black Fork is a muddy stream. Its waters, when impounded, drop heavy loads of silt and topsoil in the lake formed by the dam, and within a measurable length of time, if land control is not practised in the area above, the basin will have silted up and the dam become useless.

The other dam located at Pleasant Hill is fed from a watershed which is perhaps 40 percent wooded. It is hill country with gravel loam soil which tends naturally to absorb water. In the area there are many abandoned farms on which the soil is no longer cultivated and fields left bare; they have gone back to a state of Nature, taken over by sod and forest which drink the heaviest rainfall and check run-off water and soil erosion. As a result of these conditions, most of them purely accidental, for which man can claim little credit, the Clear Fork is, as the name implies, a clear stream carrying very little silt, and the silting in the reservoir behind the Pleasant Hill dam is very nearly imperceptible. The chances are that in a thousand years from now, the Pleasant Hill dam will still be functioning as an effective flood control unit, while the Charles Mill Dam will have silted up and become useless.

I have taken these two small units as illustrations of the problem which effects, in greater or less degree, every flood control dam and every reservoir in the whole of the United States. Costly dams impounding water for industrial or civic purposes, vary with regard to the silt menace only in the character of the watershed which feeds them. There are countless dams, great or small, which have suffered already this destructive process of silting up.

Our disastrous floods of the past half century and more have been like so many of our other catastrophes, largely man-made. Records going back to the time when the first French and Spanish came into the Mississippi Valley show that there have always been floods, but in the past, before the wilderness was subdued and put to use, they never

achieved the increasingly disastrous proportions that characterize the floods of our times.

In the beginning the whole of the vast Mississippi watershed was largely protected by great forests or prairie grass, high as a man's head, or by the rich grazing growth of the areas west of the Mississippi. Only a few small areas like the Badlands of the Dakotas were subject to flooding or erosion. When there was heavy and prolonged rainfall, the water was soaked up by the forests and heavy sod. It sank into the ground whence it emerged later, sometimes hundreds of miles distant from the spot where it fell, in springs which flowed all the year round. In the streams there were no alternating periods of flood and drouth. In addition to the sponge-like absorbent qualities of forest and prairie sod, Nature had her own check dams in the form of meandering headwater streams and in great areas of marshland.

During the past century and the beginning of this one, man brought about devastating changes in the whole of the vast Mississippi River watershed. The protective covering of forests and sod was stripped off and the earth left bare to rain and snow fall, to quick freezing and thawing, to all the destructive processes of erosion. Rain ran off the surface of the stripped land at times like water off an asphalt road. With changes of temperature snow melted quickly on bare ground instead of melting slowly among the roots or leaves or grass to check its escape.

Man set about destroying Nature's own check dams by straightening the curves in tributary streams and draining the big swamps and marshlands, channeling the flood waters directly off the land into the Mississippi and its bigger tributaries. He managed to establish a record in changing conditions over an area including more than half the Nation.

In spring, the rivers flooded, creating progressively greater destruction each year. In the hot summer months their flow diminished, sometimes to the size of a trickle, or ceased altogether. In the Ohio River great barrage dams and locks had to be constructed to permit navigation during the low-water months and huge levees to protect cities and farms during the flood months of spring. The editor of the Mississippi Waterways Journal told me that within his memory steamboats used to come high up in the reaches of the Allegheny River throughout the summer. Today, at times during the summer, there is barely enough water in the river to permit navigation of a rowboat. Yet at flood time, the river can become a torrent and wreak millions of dollars worth of damage year after year to great cities like Pittsburgh.

There is a gigantic project at present in formation for the control of the Missouri River watershed, one of the largest in the world and one of the most unruly. During the last two years alone it has caused millions of dollars worth of damage to much-needed wartime crops. Some of the damage to farms has been permanent since thousands of acres of good land have been buried under great masses of barren and very nearly use-

less gravel and sand and mud. No American river carries a greater burden of silt from over-grazed and improperly farmed areas.

Plans have been made for great check dams, but, in the case of a great silt-laden river like the Missouri, it is only a question of time until these dams become filled with mud, gravel and sand and become useless. The problem of absolute flood control in the Missouri is one which involves much more than dams. It demands reforestation of certain areas which should today be growing valuable tree crops to bolster the future economy of the Nation. It demands control of over-grazed areas and a better kind of farming in areas where today, when it rains, the water runs off unchecked to create fresh floods. The men responsible for the TVA have been far-seeing and taken these things into consideration. They have not placed their faith in the dams alone but established in conjunction with them a comprehensive program of forest management and proper land use. Perhaps the most important aspect of the entire Missouri flood-control project is that it be a far-sighted and comprehensive one and that costly mistakes be avoided from the beginning.

There are other immense benefits to be derived from a thorough system of flood control. The dams can become new sources of electrical power for industry. Their reserve flood waters can serve to irrigate rich but now arid land. The creation of great lakes and "permanent pools" in the TVA and in the Muskingum Conservancy districts have provided some of the most beautiful recreational areas and some of the finest fishing in the world, all within easy access of many of our greatest industrial cities. The restoration programs are creating new forests to provide revenue and employment for people living in wrecked forest and agricultural areas, raising the standards of living, throughout the communities affected. Whole regions, which were once man-made national economic and social liabilities, are being changed into areas which are man-made economic and social assets.

The problem of flood control and the restoration of our natural resources of soil, water, and forests are inextricably tied together. Neither can be wholly solved separately. Their solution is easily within the achievement of the American citizenry now alive. No project would mean so much to our industry, our health, indeed to our future economic welfare as a Nation. The achievement of a sound and comprehensive flood-control program requires investments both in public education and in taxpayers' money, but I think no investment could be so profitable. The money required for the carrying through of a comprehensive and sound project for control of the vast Mississippi Basin would be paid back in the space of a few years in damages saved to property, lives, agriculture and industry. Then we should not have on our hands in the Mississippi River and its tributaries a monster breaking its chains once a year, but a controlled and useful river system, paying great assets in economic welfare, in health, in water transport and in many other ways.

I believe it is not a dream that one day there will be somewhere in New Orleans a room with a big electrically operated map showing the whole of the vast Mississippi River watershed. Before it will sit an engineer who will order by radio the closing of this dam or the opening of that one on great rivers hundreds of miles away. In that day the flow of waters will be equalized to vary only slightly from one year's end to the other. When that time comes the vast and useless levees which have cost us billions of dollars, not only in their construction, repair and maintenance, but by their failure, will become as useless as the medieval fortifications surrounding European cities. They will become highways or promenades overlooking a busy traffic of barges and pleasure boats. It is simply a matter of putting the horse before the cart, of beginning at the proper end.

The Soil Conservation District as a Democratic Institution for Conservation of Agricultural Resources

H. P. RUSK, Dean, College of Agriculture, University of Illinois, Urbana

FOOD is the primary necessity of all peoples. E. Parmalee Prentice, in his recent book *Hunger and History*, says: "The history of the world has been the story of a struggle for daily bread. The primitive arts came from the search of hungry men for food. . . ." For centuries hunger was an almost constant companion of man. Often the cause of war, it is also one of the inevitable results of war. Only during the last two hundred years has any considerable portion of the human race been freed from pangs of hunger and fear of famine. In many parts of the world emanicipation of dense populations from the grip of hunger and famine is still to be accomplished.

The agricultural development of the fertile lands of the New World was the signal that started an advance which carried civilization to higher accomplishments in two centuries than it had achieved in the preceding two thousand years. An abundant supply of cheap food was the stimulus needed to start this advance. In this country it freed increasingly larger portions of our population from the pursuit of the primary necessities of life and made them available for manufacturing and other industrial and commercial activities—and these furnished the tools needed for further spectacular development of American agriculture.

Food! Food! Food in abundance for our own people, and a surplus available with which to build a commerce with the less fortunately situated peoples of Europe. Increasing and multiplying these supplies were the concern of many, but the conservation of the natural resources that made this production possible was unfortunately the concern of

only a few. Erosion and soil depletion began while the woodsman's ax was still ringing in virgin forests and while the pioneer's plow was converting a vast sea of tall prairie grass into the breadbasket of the Nation. Warnings were sounded early that the rich soils of the New World were not inexhaustible; and from the beginning of the land-grant colleges, problems of conservation were stressed along with those of production and utilization.

But throughout history, pioneering periods have been wasteful of natural resources. Lessons from centuries of Old World history were never learned or were soon forgotten by a people who could not imagine the intensity of their great grandparents' struggle to obtain an adequate food supply. The voices of our Nation's wisest prophets could retard and temper but could not stay the hand of fate. The rapid exploitation of the agricultural resources of our Nation which took place during and immediately following the pioneer days has produced hundreds of thousands of prosperous farm homes, it is true, and has contributed basically to urban industry and to the wealth that has been an important factor in the development of America, but it has also depleted our "working capital" in a profligate manner and left some wholly unnecessary scars on the beauty of our rural landscape.

Gone are the pioneer days, and with them has gone the belief that our soils could never be worn out. Proof of the fallacy of such belief is supplied by millions of acres of depleted farm lands, by gully-scarred hillsides in almost every section of the country, and by flood plains buried under several feet of unproductive subsoil that has been washed from cultivated or abandoned hillsides of adjoining water sheds—*buried flood plains* once rich from age-long accumulations of sediment transported from virgin soils by floodwaters. Many of these once-fertile valleys are rapidly becoming mere spoil dumps of a mismanaged upland agriculture.

That the conservation of our soils, our water, and our timber has become vital in the solution of one of our most important problems—that of maintaining the health, happiness, and general wellbeing of all of our people, both rural and urban—can no longer be denied. The words over the door of the Old Agriculture Building on the campus at the University have not taken on new meaning, but they have taken on added importance: "The wealth of Illinois is in her soil and her strength lies in its intelligent development." That is just as true today, after more than forty classes of agricultural students have passed through those portals, as it was the day President Draper wrote the statement.

Fortunately there is in our State and Nation a rising consciousness of the imperative need for concerted effort to save what is left of our resources of soil and forest and to build back into them something of the wealth and beauty they have lost. Unfortunately this awakening had to wait until extractive farming had noticeably depleted some of our most productive lands, until erosion had stripped the fertile topsoil from great

areas, until the rolling lands, robbed of their natural cover, let loose the torrents that have flooded farms and cities along our main water courses and deposited alarming amounts of sediment in the basins behind expensive dams, and until attempts to carry exploitive methods of agriculture into the semi-arid regions beyond the Missouri had made a dust bowl in the Great Plains.

There was something inevitable, too, about the way we brought ourselves to this day of reckoning. Since the beginning of our Nation, men of foresight have recognized the importance of the problem. George Washington more than 150 years ago, wrote: "Our lands . . . were originally very good; but use and abuse have made them quite otherwise." And then he commented on the importance of adopting "some system by which the evil may be arrested." Another great Revolutionary figure, Patrick Henry, expressed his convictions in these vigorous words: "Since the achievement of our independence, he is the greatest patriot who stops the most gullies."

Thus we see that the land-use problem is not new.. Neither is the idea new that the problem is of vital importance to all the people, farmers and nonfarmers alike. But what *is* new is the recognition that the economic system which exploited the farmer shares with the farmer who exploited the land the responsibility for the cost of repairing the damage. With this recognition of public interest and responsibility, there is a growing demand that ownership of land be considered a public trust rather than a right to exploit our resources.

To meet the public's obligation to share the cost of repairing the damage and to aid farmers in discharging their trust to conserve what is left of this great heritage, the Soil Conservation Service has been created and is doing a magnificent job.

What Is a Soil Conservation District?

Counsel, advice, and a limited amount of technical assistance on soil conservation problems have, for many years, been available to farmers through the Agricultural Extension Service and other public and private agencies. But the possibilities of modern methods of erosion control were not generally recognized by farmers or by the public until they were demonstrated on a large scale by the work of Civilian Conservation Corps camps established under the National Industrial Recovery Act to furnish productive employment to thousands of needy young men. By comparison with many other work-relief programs the accomplishments of these camps ranked high in popular favor and paved the way for public acceptance of Federal participation in erosion control as a permanent program rather than as an emergency work-relief program.

During the life of these camps many competent technicians were trained and much equipment was accumulated. The soil conservation district was conceived as a medium through which the Federal Soil

Conservation Service could legally continue to lend technical assistance and some equipment to groups of farmers who would undertake to adopt sound measures to reduce and control soil erosion caused by wind and water. The U. S. Department of Agriculture proposed the adoption of a uniform-soil-conservation-districts law in all the States. While the proposed draft was not acceptable to all States, enabling acts with modifications acceptable to the USDA have been passed by all but four States.

Do Soil Conservation Districts Duplicate Existing Machinery?

In general, soil conservation districts are set up to facilitate voluntary adoption of measures to reduce erosion and to accept government assistance in such a program. So far as I know, no other similarly constituted public body has ever been created for precisely this purpose. But there are other public agencies that function in this field. The AAA, the FSA, and credit agencies all have some soil conservation responsibilities, but the Agricultural Extension Service is the one most vitally interested in fields which overlap those of the Soil Conservation Service and the districts. In Illinois these two services have worked as a well-matched team pulling pretty much the same load. Each has supplemented the other in working on a wide range of problems related to erosion control and soil conservation. In most of the 48 Illinois counties which have soil conservation districts or districts in process of organization, the farm adviser and the local farm bureau have been largely responsible for the organization movement and have continued to coöperate with the districts. All the information which I have been able to gather leads me to believe that the same close coöperative relationship between soil conservation and extension exists in most if not all other States.

Conservation Contributes to the War Effort

I believe it conservative to say that with the wholehearted support of state extension services and experiment stations, the soil conservation program has done more to assure a physical basis for this country's future food supply than has any other program, Federal or otherwise, during the past ten years.

Fortunately for the war effort this work was under way when World War II placed imperative demands upon American agriculture for maximum production. I will confess that I was one of those who felt that our responsibility for maximum production might necessitate deferment of soil conservation programs until after the war. But results of farm management studies at the University of Illinois Agricultural Experiment Station clearly indicated that the immediate increase in yields resulting from adoption of some simple conservation practices warranted speeding up the program as a war measure rather than deferring adoption of such practices because of the war.

Conservation Pays

"Contour farming with terraces, contour farming with buffer strips, strip cropping, and contour farming the entire field with the same crop resulted in average yield increases of 8 to 14 percent for corn, soybeans, and oats in 1943 in 32 Illinois counties. Specific increases in yields were 5.3 bushels of corn, 1.6 bushels of soybeans, and 5.3 bushels of oats from "around-the-hill" farming compared with "up-and-down-the-hill" farming on the same farms (see Table 1).

TABLE 1

Average Acre-Yields of Crops Planted on the Contour and Not on the Contour, Same Farms, Illinois, 1943, based on farm-account records from 32 counties

Item	Corn	Soybeans	Oats
Number of farms	93	14	20
Yield on contour, bushels	65.7	21.7	43.3
Yield not on contour, bushels	60.4	20.1	38.0
Number of farms on which crop on the contour yielded higher	70	11	16
Difference in yield in favor of contouring, bushels	5.3	1.6	5.3

"The benefits of contour farming in 1943 were somewhat below previous years' results, since rainfall during the early part of the crop season was not a limiting factor for crop growth. Average per acre increases for the five years 1939–1943 in Illinois for crops grown on the contour compared to up and down the slope were: corn, 7.5 bushels; soybeans, 2.7 bushels; and oats, 7.4 bushels (see Table 2).

TABLE 2

Average Acre-Yields of Crops Planted on the Contour and Not on the Contour, Same Farms, Five-Year Average, 1939–1943

Item	Corn	Soybeans	Oats
Number of farms	102	12	28
Yield on contour, bushels	66.4	22.8	44.8
Yield not on contour, bushels	58.9	20.1	37.4
Number of farms on which crop on the contour yielded higher	78	11	25
Difference in yield in favor of contouring, bushels	7.5	2.7	7.4

"The importance of contour farming even the more gently sloping land is shown when the corn yield data are broken down by slope groups. Contouring increased corn yields 9.6 bushels per acre on gently sloping land (land-use-capability class 2); 5.6 bushels on moderately sloping

land (land-use-capability class 3); and 5.5 bushels on strongly sloping land (land-use-capability class 4).

"In studying the farm operating costs resulting from the use of conservation practices, farms on which all or the major part of the farming operations were on the contour were matched with comparable neighboring farms on which none of the field operations was on the contour. Results of this study on 135 farms for the three years 1940–1942 show that power and machinery costs per crop acre were practically the same on the two groups of farms (Table 3)." (*Illinois Farm Economics, University of Illinois Extension Service, April, 1944.*)

TABLE 3

Man-Labor Costs and Power-and-Machinery Costs per Crop Acre on Contour-Tilled Farms Compared With Farms Not Contour-Tilled, Three-Year Average, 1940–1942

Item	Farms contour-tilled	Farms not contour-tilled
Man labor costs	$9.93	$10.40
Power-and-machinery costs	6.85	7.00

One Team—Two Drivers

The experience of the past half dozen years has taught all of us that effective soil-conservation measures include vastly more than staking out contours or building terraces. The whole field of farm management is involved. The soil-fertility specialist with his program of lime, phosphate, potash, and legumes is needed to develop feasible plans for maintaining sufficient plant food for proper growth of ground cover and harvested crops as soil-binding materials essential in any scheme for stabilizing the soil. The crops specialist has obligations with respect to varieties and to methods of planting and cultivating that will aid the program, and the contribution that can be made by the livestock specialist must not be overlooked if we are to develop complete and well-integrated plans for soil conservation. We have learned that the soil-conservation technician has to think not only of the engineering problems involved but of the entire farm operations, including livestock. These fields have long been the accepted province of the Agricultural Experiment Station and the Extension Service.

The Soil Conservation Service recognizes these facts and has drawn heavily from the experiment stations and the extension services for aid and counsel. But it is becoming more and more evident that in the field and in contacts with farmers the activities of the Soil Conservation Service and the Extension Service are more often than not identical in scope. The farmer sees two agencies doing essentially the same work: the

Extension Service supported in part by Federal grant-in-aid appropriations and in part by state and local funds and having a large measure of state and local control, and the Soil Conservation Service supported entirely by Federal appropriation, with supervision from Washington through regional offices and with much less opportunity for state and local voice in the development of policies or the selection of personnel with whom the citizens of the State must work.

Out of this situation comes a pertinent question: Can these two agencies performing essentially the same, if not identical, service continue to function under such radically different administrative directions without developing dangerous strains on relationships with respect to fundamental programs and personalities involved? I believe that is it not too early to begin thinking about how these unnecessary strains may be avoided. Can the work of the Extension Service and of the Soil Conservation Service be better integrated at Federal, state, and county levels? What steps should be taken to coördinate or combine the administration of the two services and provide more opportunity for state and local voice in the control of the soil conservation district and its working relationships?

The future food supply of this Nation and the prosperity of those engaged in its production, as well as the maintenance of democratic procedures, are involved in the answers to these questions.

Will Returning Soldiers Seek the Land?

DR. O. R. JOHNSON, Professor and Chairman, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Missouri, Columbia

TO THOSE working chiefly in the agricultural field, the interest evidenced by the American Planning and Civic Association in the agricultural planning field by allotting a portion of its program to this subject is very significant. The excellence of much of the planning work in many urban areas is generally recognized. Some planning and zoning work has been undertaken in rural areas. So far as known there has not previously been any conspicuous effort to relate these two fields of planning.

Until recently there has been no particular reason why concern should be felt for maintaining some semblance of balance between rural and urban populations. With our agricultural lands now rather completely occupied and the more productive of these lands in fairly strong hands, it is obvious that any considerable movement of population into agriculture should be of serious concern to all interested in maintaining an optimum distribution of our people between urban and rural occupations.

From the standpoint of full utilization of our resources, the United States is industrially at about the same stage of development which we were agriculturally 75 years ago. We still have expanding frontiers in-

dustrially speaking. So far as can now be seen, industrial expansion except for short-time periods of delay can continue for many years into the future. Consequently, industrial America quite likely possesses almost unlimited capacity to assimilate additional men and capital. On the other hand the ability of agriculture to accommodate additional people without decreasing the per capita contribution to total productivity is definitely limited. As a matter of fact, if our farms were adequately provided with modern means of production, we could dispense with a considerable number of those persons now on farms and in fact with many of the farm units themselves, as their net contribution to the national food supply is negligible. This is ample basis for concern over the probable inclination of persons discharged from war plants or the Armed Services to return to the land.

In subsequent comment it will be obvious that major emphasis is given to considerations associated with increasing the physical productivity of our people. This is not done to the exclusion of production and income less material. It is recognized that psychic income, or the achievement of satisfaction and contentment, is an important consideration in determining the best plan of distribution of population. There may be times when physical production can temporarily be sacrificed for less tangible forms of production. There will also be individuals who deliberately choose lower levels of physical production for greater heights of enjoyment of less tangible forms of income. However, the position is taken that in the main we should be concerned with that distribution of our human and physical resources which will in the long run yield the largest physical return. With this brief definition of the viewpoint from which the discussion will be undertaken, we turn to the subject assigned which is intimately related to the larger question of what should be our national policy in attempting to influence population distribution.

It is undoubtedly true that there will be a considerable number of men and women both from the Armed Services and from discontinued war industries who will want to return to the land. The extent to which this desire should be encouraged, and the problems which will arise as this desire is translated into actual movement, are assumed to be the considerations of chief interest to this group. Many of these persons looking toward the land came originally from the land. Others because of their past experience or future prospects may turn to the land in the hope of avoiding uncertainties and providing reasonable assurance that a home and the basic necessities of life may be more certain rewards for their effort.

Many of us have a wholesome regard and affection for the land. While we greatly value the conveniences, refinements, and productive possibilities of urban vocations, we look forward to leisure hours and declining years spent in more of a rural setting. The inspiration of the open country and the possibilities of utilizing leisure hours in contributing to

the family's needs, both material and æsthetic, possess a strong appeal. This appeal we must admit is frequently stronger with the inexperienced than with those possessing a farming background.

Any general encouragement of such a population movement would seem to be based on the assumption that such a movement possesses important possibilities for improvement of the general level of wellbeing. Therefore, it is appropriate to attempt some evaluation of the possible effects of such a movement and to explore the possibilities of influencing that movement in such a manner that a maximum contribution and a minimum of disappointment will result.

In order to judge properly this problem, it is necessary to make certain assumptions concerning what will be the economic situation for urban and rural industries when men are discharged from the Armed Services or transferred from war to peacetime industries. Questions as the following will very clearly affect our thinking and conclusions concerning the desirability of encouraging or discouraging such a movement: (a) How rapidly can industry reconvert and begin filling in the deficit created by diversion to war effort? (b) How long will it require for these goods to be supplied? (c) What new industries will be created to provide employment? (d) How effectively can the expanded agricultural production be utilized? (e) What readjustments or shrinkage in agricultural productive efforts will be indicated? (f) What will be the wage situation and the relation between rural and urban wages? (g) How strong an effort will be made to provide export outlets for farm products expanded beyond domestic requirements to meet wartime needs? (h) What will be the national policy concerning public debt, taxation, and the impact of taxation on groups and classes?

Certain lessons which we have learned under the pressure of wartime production may materially influence the general plan of peacetime production. Farmers as well as industrialists have been impressed with the need for greater mechanization, utilization of power, and independence from hired labor. Some industries under war pressure have realized that their prewar plants are obsolete. Postwar restoration may involve entirely new policies in industrial production and call for significant redistributions of industrial population. Answers to these and many other questions can be only estimates and guesses with their accompanying uncertainties. With the uncertainties of the near future so momentous, it would seem, first of all, that any violent movements of persons discharged from the Armed Services away from their prewar vocations should be discouraged. Many unwise decisions will no doubt be made. Restlessness is quite likely to be a characteristic of these persons temporarily detached from productive activities. Many will experience serious difficulty in reëstablishing themselves in satisfying occupations. To many their prewar occupation will no longer be attractive.

We will have in our midst many persons with disability allowances.

These will all be seeking productive opportunities commensurate with their physical capabilities and personal desires. Those in this group with a farm or suburban background who, therefore, have an affection for and acquaintance with those productive activities associated with the contributions of the land directly to the living of families, will no doubt represent a considerable demand for the so-called part-time farming setup near urban centers where such a setup will supplement disability incomes. Those poorly adapted to the tasks involved will find such an environment unsatisfactory. For those well adapted, an important contribution to living can be made by enterprises such as gardens, poultry, and milk cows. Such a development will not seriously disrupt strictly farming communities but may be the means of supplementing disability allowances to give a highly satisfying level of living to the families involved.

It is entirely possible that Mr. Ford's notion of synchronizing certain part-time farming activities with feasible industrial developments should receive more serious consideration. Certain large industries are giving serious consideration to the problem of decentralization. There have already been certain industrial developments which indicate that small units are at least as efficient as the larger ones formerly used but which are now obsolete. Many expansions incurred as a result of wartime pressure will not prove efficient under postwar operating conditions. Many questions will undoubtedly be raised which will tax to the limit the knowledge, resourcefulness and resources of our efficiency engineers, planning experts, and industrial concerns.

Real concern should be felt for those who are expecting to return to the open country completely free from urban connections. These persons are risking their entire future welfare when they make such decisions. Many of these decisions will be based on inadequate or fictitious information. Those not acquainted with the hard facts of farm life will unduly emphasize the romantic aspects of the open country and the outdoors. Those with a rural or farm background will not be inclined to overemphasize the advantages of living in the open country. Because of their recent experience with conveniences of all sorts in urban environment or their observations of how rural and urban people in other parts of the world live, they will no doubt make certain demands on the country which they have not in the past been inclined to emphasize, and will value more the elimination of drudgery and the greater certainty of a fairly high level of living as compared with the level enjoyed by the great majority of the world's people. These persons will more likely act on pretty substantial facts. There is one important danger which they confront. They may frequently be misled by highly colored reports concerning new or unknown regions. So long as they confine their thinking and their commitments to areas with which they are well acquainted, they are not likely to commit serious errors of judgment.

There are a number of conditions generally recognized by the well informed which cannot be overemphasized and which can be profitably considered. First, there are no considerable new areas in the United States where unassisted real settlement opportunities exist. Second, areas widely advertised as possessing great opportunities for persons with limited resources may generally be regarded with suspicion. Third, reasonable settlement opportunities will usually be confined to medium and better grades of agricultural land.

Concerning the first mentioned point, it will be found that areas previously undeveloped will, if they have productive possibilities, require rather large cash outlays for development before they reach the point where families can depend on them. Such capital outlays cannot usually be afforded by the individual settler. This must be furnished by financing institutions or individuals possessing sufficient resources to justify low rates of interest and long periods for repayment of the principal.

Attempting to lure prospective new settlers to those areas where it is alleged adequate farm acreages can be procured at a very low cost, is a favorite pastime of unscrupulous or ignorant promoters. We can be sure of one thing—if the land is cheap, there is an excellent reason for its cheapness. It is probably of low productivity or has other handicaps which limit productivity. Such areas can sometimes be developed, but will require large acreages, large capital outlays, and more time than these settlers with limited resources can afford or provide.

Settlement opportunities on medium-to-better grades of land offer more reasonable prospects. In these areas there exist a number of possibilities. The most feasible is probably on those farms where the present proprietor desires to retire when the war emergency ends and is looking for a successor. The war period has caused the accumulation of more than the normal number of operators of this type. If the young man discharged from the Armed Services can find such a situation in his old home neighborhood, his chance for a successful arrangement is good. The retiring operator will generally be willing to furnish the real estate capital and sometimes a part of the operating capital. Or he may be willing to turn the farm over to the new operator on a sale contract basis.

An important principle to hold in mind is the necessity for making certain that the farm unit is of sufficient size not only for efficient performance of the usual farm operations but of sufficient total physical productivity that the resulting product will adequately meet operating costs, living requirements, carrying charges for capital, and provide some opportunity for saving. This is a rather high standard of requirements for an adequate farm unit. As a matter of fact at least one-third of the farms in the United States do not measure up to the minimum standard. There are two additional possibilities frequently suggested which must be regarded with care. The first of these is the suggestion that we may expect to provide for many of these returning persons through sub-

dividing present farm units. In a limited number of cases this would be possible. More frequently, however, the result will be reduced efficiency, decreased net production from the land, and consequent reduced level of living.

The other suggestion frequently made involves large drainage or irrigation projects; or the building of structures to prevent floods. Such proposals have two important limitations. First is that of capital requirements and a rather slow rate of liquidation of capital outlays. Second is that the project too often becomes one of colonizing an entire neighborhood with families all of whom have the same limitations. Such a project is generally a hazardous one. A more nearly ideal community must be one where there are some families long established, some beginners, some old, some young, some with considerable resources, others who have not yet had opportunity to accumulate resources, many with years of highly valuable experience behind them, others venturesome and trying to learn. The whole community organization and setup is exceedingly difficult to develop where there is too much uniformity among the settlers.

If it could be implemented, it would be desirable to select from those desiring to return to the country the ones most highly qualified from the standpoint of ability, background, desires, and resources to replace less effective ones who are now on many of our farms and to place the less effective ones in a more appropriate occupation and environment. More than one-fourth of our farms are now subsistence farms or less. As was indicated earlier, in many cases the fault lies in the inadequacy of the farm unit itself. In others it is the lack of adaptability of the operator and his family. Many of these inadequate farm units could be combined with adjacent farms with a gain to society. Not often will two or three inadequate farm units be located side by side or near enough to one another so that they might be combined into an effective farm unit. Zoning laws in some States are designed to eliminate considerable areas where inadequate farm units are the rule and not the exception.

If we follow the same pattern which developed following the First World War in returning persons to the land, we will again have many families attempting to make a place for themselves in the open country under circumstances where it is physically impossible for them to achieve their objectives. Anything which can be done to prevent this will obviously be in the national interest. We already have considerable activity in attempts to provide inadequate units to inexperienced prospective rural settlers. It would be anticipating too much to expect zoning laws completely to protect the uninformed and those needing protection most. The fact that eventual adjustment must mean fewer farms but more effective ones, and the productive absorption by urban occupations of most of the released manpower, if we are to have a balanced distribution of our total national productive powers, should cause us all to con-

sider very thoroughly their prospects for achieving the desired objectives before encouraging released or temporarily displaced persons and families to try to settle in the open country.

The foregoing comments must not be interpreted as approval of any system of rigid controls of the free movement of persons from one environment or employment to another. So long as they can remain self-supporting, their right to choose freely both dwelling place and type of employment, within the limits of their social responsibility, should be preserved. Concentration on learning, and an impartial presentation of, the facts concerning opportunities, requirements, and conditions for a satisfying level of living, to those contemplating, or confronted with the necessity of a change of vocation or location, is clearly indicated. Facilitation of shifts, only when there is reasonable prospect of favorable consequences for the individual concerned, is a justifiable public policy.

Conservation Faces Postwar Dangers

TOM WALLACE, Editor, Louisville Times, Louisville, Ky.

I SHALL NOT attempt to inspire you by discussing biological values and other values of reserves now menaced by self-seekers' aggressiveness and by popular approval of water impoundments, wherever, and for whatever purpose proposed.

I offer a single suggestion. In my opinion the American Planning and Civic Association needs a full-time public relations man or woman to present the organization's argument, publicly in print and orally, and across desks of newspaper executives, a traveling, writing, speaking and talking individual.

Long experience convinces me that when the press is wrong on such subjects it is because its policymakers are insufficiently informed.

Only a well-versed and well-equipped person can tell newspaper people what they should know about problems which interest the Association.

If, for example, a group of Army engineers agrees that artificializing Great Falls of Potomac River, and its surroundings almost in the Capitol's shadow, almost at the Capital's borders, would improve the scene as part of Washington's park system would improve the waterfall, many intelligent people, including newspaper heads, will assume that the engineers are right.

The difference between the scenic values, wildlife values, biological values of natural lakes and impoundments is not understood popularly, or by newspaper executives because most of the talking that is done, most of the writing that gets into print, is in behalf of impoundments.

The National Conference on State Parks met in North Carolina's mountains a dozen years ago. An entertainment feature was a motorcade to a high point from which a power impoundment at Lake James was seen·

Around its margin ran a cedar-red streak which seemed, at a distance of ten miles, a lead pencil's size. I asked what it was. The local Chamber of Commerce man or utilities man said he could see nothing but green forest running down to blue water.

I deserted the motorcade, drove to the impoundment and found what I expected, a thirty-foot belt of red mud around the margin, the effect of draw-off.

The average publisher never sees an impoundment. As described in his paper, through, perhaps, press association dispatches reflecting work of public relations people, the typical impoundment differs from Lake Como only in that the length of its shoreline is more nearly that of Lake Superior's shoreline. The prospective impoundment's shoreline so runs that it will tap the tourist traffic stream for gold and diamonds at all points, in which the Chamber of Commerce is interested.

The proposed impoundment will, the public is told, through the columns of an insufficiently vigilant press, after pouring millions of dollars into pockets of patrons of grocers and clothiers of the region, make the area rich in industries by providing irresistibly cheap electric current.

Some years ago building materials were not selling satisfactorily. The building materials trade hit upon a good device. Functionaries called dynamiters were employed, to make personal calls and tell homeowners that their homes were out of date and would be vastly improved by remodeling.

Through the real estate columns of newspapers, dynamiters' employers easily got into publication pictures showing the house before and after remodeling.

In many cases the transformation made architects and other artists weep, but transformation meant money spent locally. Topmost executives' attention to the fraud and the outrage probably never was invited by any competent objector.

Something comparable to dynamiting is relied on to pave the way for such a project as abolishing Jackson Hole National Monument, but the dynamiters work in publicity channels.

As a rule the press serves the dynamiters unless someone who is capable gets to uppermost executives with real information.

Those who attempt to clear the way for encroachment upon a national forest, destruction of a national monument, obliteration of a waterfall don't depend on news releases. They work through Chambers of Commerce, press associations, elected public officers, newspaper people, not as corrupters, but as persuaders.

Conservationists depend too largely upon less effective means of getting support of newspapers.

All newspapers desire best use of natural resources, but often they endorse a destructive local project which they do not recognize as destructive because they don't know all of the facts.

Causes championed by the American Planning and Civic Association are good causes supported by informed people. It is easier to procure a competent man or woman to represent such causes than it is to procure his equal in capacity, at anything like the same price, to represent a bad cause.

Two surprises await those who meet, in the arena, privilege seekers' lobbyists. One is lobby cost. The other is the modest talent that is assembled at such cost. Lobbyists for bad causes are not hard to meet and beat if you employ, as they do, persistence, vigilance, Johnny-on-the-spotness.

My wife is an ardent conservationist. Soon after the Jackson-Hole-Monument-controversy began I arrived at home for dinner to find her sense of justice outraged at high-handedness of the President. She had read a lobby-planted article in a magazine.

I explained to that intelligent audience the antiquity of the Antiquities Act.

How business organizations and newspaper publishers, speaking generally, react to the proposal that a high dam be built anywhere, is at the moment illustrated at Falmouth, Ky., where $8,000,000, it is said, will be the construction cost of a flood-control dam.

Licking River runs through a foothills area in which most of the valuable farm land is in narrow valleys. Farmers in several counties, and county seat townsfolk, say the proposed dam will flood so large a proportion of the arable lands in those counties that it will be disastrous to county capitals as well as to farmers. If the farmers are forced to move they may receive the value of their lands, but the county towns will not be compensated, and county road revenues, it is contended, would be insufficient for new county roads even if State Roads should be re-located.

But the Falmouth Baptist Church is the scene of a meeting at which the Falmouth Rotary Club, the Falmouth Business Men's Club, scenting distribution of $8,000,000 in and about Falmouth, are ardent for the dam.

The local paper, *The Falmouth Outlook*, in good faith of course, welcomes the dam as a blessing undisguised, in its area, foresees industrialization through electric current production, overlooks the engineer who says, for publication: "Where would we get a market for electric current?" and flays everyone who questions the wisdom of the plan.

That is in miniature what happens usually when a dam is proposed. I am not discussing merits of the proposed Licking River Dam. I am talking about how and why newspapers, commonly, are for the dam; for any dam.

Newspapers, unless adequately informed, sometimes even if informed, are pro-dam, and they are always adequately informed by the pro-dammers.

The attitude of the typical newspaper where it is not exceptionally informed, reflects the attitude of the local Chamber of Commerce.

The attitude of the local Chamber of Commerce, widely, is that of the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce toward the Mundt amendment to the Barkley-Spence water pollution bill. The Izaak Walton League of America of which Representative Mundt is a member, pushed through the House an amendment providing that new sources of pollution should not be created without consent of the Federal Government. The Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce derisively dubbed the members of that organization a highly vocal bunch of fishermen.

I was a member of a committee which asked the Louisville Board of Trade to lend a hand to create a National Park at Mammoth Cave. The Louisville Board of Trade—which later, better informed, did lend a hand—said flatly that the project was impractical and that the Board of Trade was composed of practical businessmen.

The uninformed practical business man, including the newspaper publisher, is the major obstacle to success of projects which interest the American Planning and Civic Association.

The quality of newspaper publishers varies. They are—if you include, as you should, publishers of all classes of newspapers—as the sands of the sea for a multitude and—when they oppose you—more terrible than an army with banners. They are not as much alike as the sands of the sea, but many of them are, in matters which concern you, among our most unenlightened practical business men.

Get to them, inform them, and you will find nine in ten of them respectworthy and helpful.

"Land Grabbers?" The Facts Show We Are Not

NEWTON B. DRURY, Director, National Park Service, Chicago, Ill.

PRESSURES arising from the demands of war, as well as growing conflicts between utilitarian and conservation concepts, have led to recent definite challenges to the policies of the National Park Service. These have been directed primarily to what has been assumed to be the land acquisition program of the Service. In connection with the Jackson Hole National Monument controversy, there was ample evidence that the objectives of the National Park Service in this regard were either being deliberately misrepresented, or were completely misunderstood.

The *Partial Report of the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys Pursuant to S. Res. 241, 76th Congress,* contained this significant statement:

> There are certain Government agencies that habitually and regularly include in their withdrawals far larger areas than could possibly be justified after a careful examination of the actual and proper needs. Probably the most flagrant example of this constant overreaching is to be found in the actions of the National Park Service in the setting up of national parks and monuments. There is,

apparently, no limit to the demands of that agency for additional areas to administer.

It is sincerely believed that this is a misconception of the attitude of the National Park Service.

At hearings held during 1943 by a subcommittee of the Sneate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys in various western towns, administrative officials of the National Park Service endeavored to answer thi charge. At the hearing in Fredonia, Arizona, the Director made this statement:

> We are confining our attention to the areas of national caliber which are outstanding in natural beauty, wildlife values, historical and scenic interest, and we can, I agree with you, readily imperil the high standards which we have tried to maintain for the national-park system, if we take in too much territory.
>
> Now the question as to how much land it is reasonable to include in national parks and monuments, is, of course, debatable. The fact is that, of the total land area of the United States, only about three-quarters of 1 percent, at the present time, is included in all the different types of areas administered by the National Park Service. In general, our approach is not to add to this number of areas or acreage, except where there are outstanding examples of scenery and other values such as we are supposed to preserve in parks and monuments, examples that are distinctly of interest to the Nation as a whole That, too, I think we have to do, without injustice either to individuals concerned or the communities where these areas are located.

At these hearings the National Park Service has taken exception to the charge of "land grabbing," but it has welcomed the opportunity to explain its land policies to members of Congress, to conservationists, to those who wish to use park lands for private commercial gain, and to the public generally, which stands to gain or lose most by any change in park conservation principles and practices since the national park areas are established "for the benefit and enjoyment of the people."

An impartial review of the history of the National Park System will, we believe, verify the statement that the long-range policy guiding its growth has been one of restricting the System to areas superlative in their own fields of scenery, natural science, or history. Emphasis has been placed upon quality rather than quantity, and upon the national rather than the local significance of the areas acquired.

Let us review some of that history.

Establishment of national parks by act of Congress began in 1872 with Yellowstone National Park. Up to 1916, when Congress created the National Park Service, 16 national parks, the Hot Springs Reservation, and 56 national monuments and related reservations had been established. Unquestionably, before 1916 a few areas had crept into the National Park System which did not measure up to national park standards. No Federal agency existed to investigate the national importance of their scenic, scientific or historic characteristics. The Ser-

vice believes that had it been in existence at the turn of the century, its stand against inclusion in the System of these substandard areas would have been heeded by Congress.

This Service since its organization has hoped and planned to relinquish jurisdiction over some such properties. Unfortunately, in most cases this has been impossible. No units of the National Park System, whether established by act of Congress or by Presidential Proclamation, may be abolished without authority of Congress. Paradoxical as it may seem in the face of the present Jackson Hole controversy, it is far easier to establish a new area with the approval of Congress than to abolish an existing one. Once a park or monument is established and accepted by the local people, its abolition usually is considered an affront to local pride.

When the consolidation of national parks and allied areas under the National Park Service took place in 1933 by Executive Order, certain areas were inherited which were not characteristic of the National Park System. Efforts to remove them from the national category and give them state or local park status have in general been met by united local opposition supported by Congressional delegations from the States concerned.

National Cemetery Relinquished.—Among the areas transferred to National Park Service jurisdiction in 1933 were several national cemeteries within or near national military parks. Recently, the demand for burial space in these cemeteries has increased, giving rise to the question as to whether cemeteries in this group shall be enlarged. The National Park Service has taken the position that existing national cemeteries under its jurisdiction shall not be extended, since any such increase would encroach upon the historic area of the national military park with which the cemetery is associated. Moreover, we have felt that operation of such enlarged cemeteries would not be a proper function of the Service.

This conviction has led to a recent definite step. The Chattanooga National Cemetery, Tennessee, one of those transferred to the National Park System in 1933, is not located on historic ground and is not adjacent to Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park. It has nearly 14,000 unoccupied grave sites. With the concurrence of the Secretary of War, and approval by the Bureau of the Budget, an act to transfer jurisdiction over this cemetery to the War Department was passed in the last session of the Congress, and approved by the President. This is typical of the endeavor of the Service to concentrate its activities in the fields primarily covered by the basic act establishing it.

Many Park Proposals Rejected.—From 1933 to 1940 the Service investigated 353 areas proposed for national park, monument, or related purposes. Practically all of these proposals were disapproved on the ground that the areas under consideration were not of national-park caliber. During the same period, 420 additional park proposals were

made, but were not investigated or otherwise acted upon, largely because of lack of funds and personnel. Among the areas proposed for national park status which have been adversely reported upon were the scenic and well-known Pikes Peak and Mount Baker.

As to the charge that "habitually and regularly" certain Governmental agencies "include in their withdrawals far larger areas than could possibly be justified after a careful examination of the actual and proper needs," the record shows that in wilderness national parks the National Park Service in general has erred in taking too little land, resulting in inadequate range for native wildlife and creating administrative difficulties; and Congress has frequently rectified such park boundaries.

Recreational Demonstration Areas Transferred.—In line with Congressional authority requested by the Department, upon advice of the National Park Service, and granted in 1942, more than half of the 46 "recreational demonstration areas" have been relinquished. Fifteen and part of another have been transferred to the respective States, and two others have been approved by the President for such transfer. Nine, and part of one other, have been added to the National Park System, primarily to existing park areas. One has been transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation. It is expected that 13 additional demonstration areas will be transferred to their respective States or political subdivisions thereof when these are in a position to administer them. Five are being retained in their present status awaiting determination as to their best disposition.

The status of all 46 recreational demonstration areas is shown below:

RECREATIONAL DEMONSTRATION AREAS
June 30, 1944

Area	State	Acreage	Disposition
Acadia	Maine	5,660	Added to Acadia National Park, June 6, 1942.
Alexander H. Stephens	Georgia	940	
Badlands	South Dakota	43,414	Added to Badlands National Monument by Act of June 26, 1936.
Beach Pond	Rhode Island	3,472	Transferred to State, June 28, 1943.
Bear Brook	New Hampshire	6,155	Transferred to State, May 12, 1943.
Blue Knob	Pennsylvania	5,136	
Blue Ridge	North Carolina) Virginia)	10,585	Added to Blue Ridge Parkway, June 30, 1936.
Bull Run	Virginia	1,605	Designated as Manassas National Battlefield Park, June 10. 1939.
Camden Hills	Maine	4,962	
Catoctin	Maryland	9,919	
Cheraw	South Carolina	6,825	6,619 acres transferred to State, June 9, 1944. 206 acres transferred to Fish & Wildlife Service, May 10, 1944.

RECREATIONAL DEMONSTRATION AREAS, continued

Area	State	Acreage	Disposition
Chopawamsic	Virginia	15,904	Added to National Capital Park System, August 13, 1940.
Crabtree Creek	North Carolina	4,983	Transferred to State, April 6, 1943.
Cuivre River	Missouri	5,759	
Custer	South Dakota	20,405	
Fall Creek Falls	Tennessee	15,777	Transfer to State approved by President, awaiting acceptance.
French Creek	Pennsylvania	6,198	214 acres established as Hopewell Village National Historic Site, August 3, 1938. Remaining 5,984 acres added to Site, June 6, 1942.
Hard Labor Creek	Georgia	5,804	
Hickory Run	Pennsylvania	13,386	
Kings Mountain	South Carolina	10,113	3,972 acres added to Kings Mountain National Military Park, July 11, 1940. Remaining 6,141 acres transferred to the State, May 30, 1944.
Lake Guernsey	Wyoming	1,753	Transferred to Bureau of Reclamation, June 8, 1943.
Lake Murray	Oklahoma	2,228	Transferred to State, February 20, 1943.
Lake of the Ozarks	Missouri	16,196	
Laurel Hill	Pennsylvania	4,026	
Mendocino Woodlands	California	5,425	
Montgomery Bell	Tennessee	3,744	Transferred to State, June 9, 1943
Montserrat	Missouri	3,441	
Oak Mountain	Alabama	7,805	Transferred to State, April 30, 1943.
Otter Creek	Kentucky	2,445	
Pere Marquette	Illinois	2,522	Transferred to State, May 7, 1943.
Pine Mountain	Georgia	3,018	
Raccoon Creek	Pennsylvania	5,035	
Roosevelt	North Dakota	66,376	
St. Croix	Minnesota	18,499	Transferred to State, Sept. 27, 1943.
Shelby Forest	Tennessee	12,395	Transfer to State approved by President, awaiting acceptance.
Shenandoah	Virginia	10,129	Added to Shenandoah National Park, June 6, 1942.
Silver Creek	Oregon	4,093	
Swift Creek	Virginia	7,605	
Versailles	Indiana	5,371	Transferred to State, April 20, 1943.
Waysides (6 units)	South Carolina	228	Transferred to State, June 9, 1944.
Waysides (6 units)	Virginia	206	Transferred to State, March 26, 1943.
Waterloo	Michigan	12,395	Transferred to State, June 15 1943.
Winamac	Indiana	6,233	Transferred to State, April 20, 1943.
White Sands	New Mexico	1,719	Added to White Sands National Monument, June 6, 1942.
Yankee Springs	Michigan	4,197	Transferred to State, June 15, 1943.

Boundary Studies.—As Director of the National Park Service, I have been interested in promoting careful studies of the lands within each of the established areas of the System. Only through such studies can we determine whether these areas are adequate to meet their objectives, or whether, as is sometimes claimed, their boundaries contain lands that are not essential to the basic purposes of national parks or monuments, which might be relinquished to other uses. War conditions have made it impracticable to push these investigations, but incidental to other work they are going on. Our land program contemplates disposal of unessential tracts as well as acquisition of desirable private or public holdings within established boundaries.

Other examples could be given of the disposition of the National Park Service to confine itself to its proper and legitimate sphere. My object here is merely to cite enough facts to indicate the injustice of the implications of "land grabbing" propensities on the part of the National Park Service.

President Roosevelt Vetoes the Bill to Abolish Jackson Hole National Monument

THE fight to abolish Jackson Hole National Monument created by Presidential Proclamation of March 15, 1943, is an illustration of short-sighted, local opposition by part of the citizens, to an act of the President which was based on an Act of Congress, and which, in the main, simply transfers Federally-owned land from one category to another. The private lands involved are less than 50,000 acres. Of these some 33,000 acres were purchased by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. as a public service to be donated to the people of the United States under the custody of the National Park Service. The Barrett Bill which was high-pressured through the 78th Congress, without regard to the merits of the case, was given a pocket veto by President Roosevelt on December 29, 1944. The Memorandum of Disapproval so well sets forth the principles involved that we take pleasure in presenting it here.

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I have withheld my approval from H. R. 2241, "To abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument as created by Presidential Proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943."

The effect of this bill would be to deprive the people of the United States of the benefits of an area of national significance from the standpoint of naturalistic, historic, scientific, and recreational values. The Jackson Hole National Monument as established by Proclamation No. 2578 constitutes an outstanding example of a valley formed by block-faulting and glacial action, and has as significant a story to tell of these great forces of nature as has the Grand Canyon to reveal of erosive processes. It also constitutes a breeding and feeding ground for rare types of birds and animal life. For many years it was a celebrated rendezvous of trappers and Indians; very few areas of the West preserve as many frontier associations. In addition, it provides the necessary foreground for the great mountain peaks in the adjoining Grand Teton National Park, and in its scenic and geologic characteristics forms an integral part of the whole Grand Teton region.

In issuing the proclamation creating the Jackson Hole National Monument, I followed precedents repeatedly established by my predecessors, beginning with President Theodore Roosevelt, in exercising the authority conferred by section 2 of the Antiquities Act approved by the Congress on June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225). Eighty-two national monuments have been established by Presidents of the United States of both political parties. Seven of these monuments are larger than the Jackson Hole National Monument. There are few official acts of the President of the United States, in the field of conservation or in any other phase of

Government, so amply supported by precedent, as is the proclamation establishing Jackson Hole National Monument. In the light of the legislative history of the Antiquities Act of June 8, 1906, and the interpretation placed thereon by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Cameron* v. *United States* (252 U. S. 450), I am convinced that Jackson Hole is an "object of historic or scientific interest" within the meaning of that act. Therefore, I cannot assent to the position taken by the proponents of H. R. 2241 that the monument reserve should be annulled on the ground that there was no authority for its creation.

The proclamation establishing the Jackson Hole National Monument reserved only the Federal lands within appropriately designated boundaries, and was issued subject to all valid existing rights. As in the case of many other Federal reservations, certain private and State lands are also within the boundaries designated in the proclamation. These lands, which comprise a small fraction of the total acreage, are not affected in any way by the proclamation. They are still in private and State ownership and the rights of the owners are the same as they were before the proclamation was issued. No lands have been or can be confiscated; no citizens have been or can be dispossessed. Moreover, private property and incomes within the monument boundaries remain subject to taxation by the State and county to the same extent as they were before the monument was established.

Soon after Jackson Hole National Monument was created, the Secretary of the Interior issued a policy statement setting forth definite principles to govern the administration of the Federal lands within the monument. This statement provides for the continuance of all permits issued by the Forest Service or other Federal agencies for the use of lands now within the national monument during the lifetime of the present holders and the members of their immediate families. In this statement the Secretary recognized existing grazing privileges on monument lands and existing stock driveway privileges, and declared that cattlemen desiring in the spring and fall to drive their cattle across monument lands, between their respective ranches and the summer ranges, would be permitted to do so as a matter of settled administrative policy.

I recognize the seriousness of the tax problem that might be produced in Teton County, Wyo., were those lands within the monument boundaries which have been acquired by private interests, for ultimate incorporation in the monument, to be removed from the tax rolls at a time when fully equivalent revenues have not as yet accrued to the county through the development of the tourist attractions of the region. I would be sympathetic to the enactment of legislation whereby revenues derived by the Federal Government from the national park and monument system could be used to offset, on an equitable basis, any loss of taxes due to the Federal acquisition, by donation or purchase, of private lands within the monument. I would also be sympathetic to the enact-

ment of legislation that would incorporate into law the administrative policies with respect to the private utilization of Federal lands within the monument to which I have already referred. Among other things, such legislation might provide assurance for private landholders within the monument who now have grazing privileges on Federal lands that these privileges will be continued to them, and to their heirs and assigns, so long as the lands to which these privileges are appurtenant remain in private ownership.

In the establishment of the Jackson Hole National Monument consideration was given to the interests of the people of the United States as a whole in order that the area might be preserved and made available to our citizens for the realization of its highest values, including its scenery, its scientific interest, its wildlife, and its history. I believe that whatever reasonable objections may exist to the continuance of the monument can be overcome without depriving this area of the protection to which it is justly entitled under the Antiquities Act of June 8, 1906, and under the other laws relating to national monuments. Therefore, it would seem to me that the proper remedy in this situation is not the undoing of what has been done, but the making of such adjustments as may be appropriate to meet the local conditions.

For these reasons I feel that it is my duty to withhold approval from H. R. 2241.

THE WHITE HOUSE:
Franklin D. Roosevelt.
December 29, 1944.

Postwar Employment by Business

FREDERICK C. CRAWFORD, President, Thompson Products, Inc. and Subsidiaries, Cleveland, Ohio

WE ARE going to win this war. It may be long and it may be costly, but win it we certainly shall. When Americans unite, nothing can lick them. Today we find this country united as to its war goal: Victory through unconditional surrender.

And we find Americans united as to the means of attaining that goal; in agreement on the rules of the game we must play to win Victory; in accord in their willing acceptance of the burden of vast armies, navies, airplanes, guns, ships, tanks, debt, long hours, inconvenience, sacrifice, sweat and toil.

There is no argument about what rules to follow to win the war. We are united on that. But the end of the war will not bring the end of our problems. Rather, it will bring into bold relief the great problems of the postwar which we must solve.

Fortunately, we are united as to our postwar objectives. All the fears, the longings, the hopes for the material welfare of our country are wrapped up in the one word—jobs; jobs which mean a higher standard of living, greater opportunities, more security, a better America.

The stage is set for a great postwar period. Great potential markets exist both at home and abroad. There is a tremendous pent up demand for our products, and we have the new products the people want. And the people have accumulated unprecedented savings with which to back up their demands. There will be great domestic and foreign need for our goods.

Conditions are set for a great postwar production of useful things. We have a vastly expanded materials supply, a trained labor force, improved technocracy and management know-how.

Great markets and great production can make great prosperity for postwar America. Many see a happy future in this. But these things are only potentialities. It will take human initiative to give life to these latent possibilities, and to bring the prosperity, the better standard of living, and the jobs that we want.

The problem that confronts the American people is not that of uniting on postwar goals, but that of uniting upon some plan to tackle the job of attaining those goals. In time of war, it is so obvious what we must do. Our postwar course is less clear. When we come to talk about it, we find great confusion, many plans. Socialists, economists, the government, the teachers, the preachers, the politicians, the businessmen and the screwballs, all are making plans and all are arguing about the postwar rules under which we must live.

On the one hand we have reformers who are determined to run the show. They say we have new conditions with which to cope, that there must be a new set-up. They talk about vast governmental spending, governmental control and governmental tricks of legerdemain. They talk about freedom from all unpleasant things. They talk a sort of creeping collectivism.

Past Holds the Key to the Future

On the other hand, many Americans, seeking a guide to the future, look back upon a glorious record of free enterprise in the history of this country. They look to the fundamentals. They believe that the spark plug of it all is freedom of opportunity, freedom to risk and to win and to lose. They believe that those fundamentals never change, that honesty and thrift and work are the way to bring a better America.

Today, gentlemen, business has a plan for the postwar. The business program calls for a restoration of the system of opportunity, the system of free enterprise, that we have had in the past in this country. We look to a better America through greater production. We can't have more in this country unless we produce more. And we look for the creation of a framework of laws that will make it possible for free opportunity to exist by removing the obstacles to full production.

Greater production is the key to a better material life. Why can't we learn that in America? The worker comes to me and wants a job. I ask him what he has to sell.

"My customers want radios and automobiles and useful things," I tell him. "Have you any of these to sell?"

"No," says the worker. "I have only hours of time to sell."

But my customers don't want hours of time. They want useful things. Why can't we in this country learn that the secret of producing things to sustain the standard of living is simply the trick of changing hours of time into useful things? If we want more abundance, we have got to turn hours of time more rapidly into more useful things, thus creating the abundance that we talk about.

Where Jobs Must Come From

We've got to do it faster. We've got to have better machinery. Better machinery comes through new investments. New investments come through the desire for profits. And with better machines and the co-operation of labor and of management, we can turn hours of time more quickly into the useful things that create the bargains that bring the orders that make the jobs that keep the wheels of prosperity going 'round and 'round.

How could we miss that one in this country of ours, this Nation which was built upon production? The philosophy that to produce less per hour of time will benefit the worker is going to crucify us if we don't straighten it out. It is possible to have this greater production only if the country

operates under policies and rules and regulations that make possible the freedom of enterprise.

We are told we must have a fourth greater number of jobs if all are to work when the war is over. Any man on the street will tell you that to find a job he must find an employer. Thus, we must have a fourth greater number of employers in the postwar.

And any man on the street, when asked why he did not become an employer, will tell you that it takes capital; thus, we must have a fourth more capital in this country in the postwar to create the employers to create the jobs that will make America a happier land.

And where do we get the capital? Capital only comes when the incentive for profit exists, when men have the freedom to risk and to win and to lose, to start a new business, to try their hands at becoming employers.

You and I know that the jobs of the future must come from companies not yet born. Look back to 1900, if you don't think it is true. Let's say that in 1900 we decreed there would be no new companies, that all jobs must be found in companies then existing. There would have been no radio, no automobile, no movie, no concrete roads, none of the great industries that in the past forty years have given so much abundance and so many jobs.

Through policies that make it almost impossible to start a new business, through taxation that says if you win you lose, and if you lose, it is your hard luck, harsh controls have been placed upon enterprise today.

Latent Energies Must Be Released

We can have a great future in this country. The conditions for prosperity are present. But they are latent. We must choose the rules under which we are going to play the game. We must adopt plans that will release the latent energies of the American people.

All Americans must determine these rules; not one class, not labor, not business, not the churches, or the schools. All Americans, acting together, united through public opinion, will determine the kind of America we are going to have. And that is our great problem, because a lot of Americans must learn a lot more about how wealth is produced in this country and how jobs are created, before we get the right rules.

We have been drifting for years, drifting away from freedom of opportunity, at an alarming rate, drifting into a kind of collectivism.

How Fascism Crept Upon Germany

Let me digress and tell you a story that stirs me deeply. In 1936 I was in Germany, visiting an old-time German manufacturer, the owner of a business, a fine old German who loved his country, educated his boys in America. He was a German of the old school.

It was the time in Germany when deficit spending was the thing,

when vast apartment house projects were being built, with a geranium box on each window sill. There was much talk about the common man and the folk's car that the government would supply for each humble German. It was the time when the German government's statement of intentions sounded so good and the crowds cheered each new utterance from the Reich. It was a time when "selfish industry" was being smeared and the demand for social justice was running high.

And so I visited my old German friend. He was sorely disturbed. He said to me, "I wonder if I am old-fashioned. Surely, the cry was for jobs. And the jobs have been created. Perhaps it is a new day and I don't understand where these things are leading us."

He explained how everything was done under the excuse of an emergency. He explained how taxes were imposed, not merely to raise revenue to defray the legitimate cost of government, but to shape the course of life and to reform people and business. He told me how taxation forced him to plow his profits back into more and more war plants. And he didn't want to do it. He didn't know what they were for.

Nazis Tightened Labor Controls

It was the time when labor controls were being imposed by government, when a Nazi Director of Employment was being put in every plant to settle all labor problems, and no longer did management and men sit down and bargain. It was a time when there were parades on every holiday.

I saw a magnificent parade on May Day. And I said, "Doctor, what enthusiasm!"

My friend said, "I receive orders to give a full day's wages and to order my people to parade on this day. This is not spontaneous."

There was an old professor in that town. He talked a great deal about his rights, and about freedom and especially about freedom of speech. He had a library of which he was proud. One day orders were issued and soldiers with guns knocked down his door and carried the old professor off and burned his books. When the crowd didn't like it, there was much talk about how the government, in time of emergency, must maintain its prestige.

I sat with the old doctor. He defined for me creeping fascism as he saw it coming upon his country. And he talked much about whether Germans had rights or didn't have rights.

"Are we free citizens, or aren't we free citizens?" he asked.

He related the steps that had led up to the present situation; deficit spending on behalf of the common man and the creating of jobs; taxation to bring reform, to play at emergencies, always the emergency of national defense; powers seized illegally in violation of oath of office and of the fundamental law of the land; emergency powers assumed, limited only by what the crowd would stand.

Then, the coming of brown shirts with guns, and the crowds cheering and talking of human rights before property rights. And the action all justified on the grounds that in time of emergency the government's prestige must be maintained.

It Can Happen Here

How strangely familiar that story is. How it smacks of what happened in Chicago at the Montgomery Ward Company.

Here was labor controlled by government. Why wasn't there an election in that plant for five months after the contract ran out? Why was maintenance of membership jammed down management's throat when there was plenty of time to hold an election? Here was a declared emergency of national danger. Here was the assumption that war powers were limited only by what the people would stand. Here was the seizure order in violation of oath of office and fundamental law, because that action was unconstitutional!

Then, the soldiers and the guns appeared and the crowds cheered and the action was justified by the assertion that the prestige of the government must be maintained in time of danger.

You and I thought it couldn't happen here. But it did. A perfect example of collectivism, a slow creeping collectivism. So plausible each step seems, but this creeping menace threatens to destroy all freedom of opportunity upon which the better America we hope for must be founded.

What a challenge to Americans! What industrialist, what real red-blooded American manager, can sit at his desk and worry about petty problems with a fight on like this?

What is the use of building a business—and it is the greatest fun in the world to build a business—if we don't maintain freedom in our country, freedom in which businesses can be created and grow and thrive and make jobs in a better America? Where is the old fighting spirit that tore down the forests and built the country of wealth and opportunity and abundance that we are so proud of, founded on freedom of worship and freedom of speech and freedom to work?

Rebirth of Leadership Needed

What we need today is a rebirth of that old leadership. And that is why I am here today, to appeal to you for a better business leadership in the affairs of the Nation, a better business statesmanship to take the lead in the fight for a better America.

Courageous, dynamic, optimistic leadership is needed, ready to fight for the basic fundamentals, ready to gamble all or nothing, ready to arouse our whole people to the realization of their danger, and to an appreciation of the mighty latent power that lies in our people. Only they, under freedom, can build the America they want. Let's have done with the host of philosophic appeasers who sacrifice freedom for peace.

You say, "All right, where do we begin?"

I want to suggest three ideas which I think American management must grasp if it is to go at this job.

First, what are your duties and my duties of citizenship? Have we realized that government by the people, for the people, and of the people won't work unless the American people work at it?

We divide our life into three major activities—social, political, and economic. Let's stop complaining about the churches and schools and get ourselves into the social life of this country. Let's stop talking about the mistakes of local politics, and take time to get into local politics. Let's learn that if everyone sweeps the porch and the street in front of his house, all of America will be swept clean. And, third, let's take time to tell the American people that they are the beneficiaries of this wonderful system we have.

The second idea I think we must grasp, is this: You and I must educate ourselves for a broader leadership for all Americans. The American people still distrust our motives. The American people don't like pressure groups, and they think we are one.

This is a great, broad campaign, like the Russian front, two thousand miles long. We must have a forward movement of the whole front. If we do, the petty problems in your plant will be outflanked by the whole movement, sweeping forward under the leadership of better business statesmanship.

If pressure groups say to the American people, "Taxes are too high," they say, "So what?" But if we appear before the American people as leaders of all Americans, moving toward a better material life, and show them that taxes are interfering with that progress, they will change them quickly enough.

Jobs and Government are Related

Third, I think that we have a task to perform in bringing the public mind to an understanding of the connection between jobs and the government we live under.

Do you realize that every American lives a double life? First, he is a worker seeking a place in the country's economy, seeking a job. Second, he is an American citizen with political obligations. His vote determines the rules and regulations under which business shall operate in this country. And today, unfortunately, the overwhelming majority of American people do not relate the two.

Once we have properly accepted the responsibilities of leadership and have shown the worker that what he does politically determines the kind of job he is going to have, you won't have to worry about the American people removing the handicaps and obstacles that stand in the way of a better America.

Some of the restrictions that looked so reasonable when they were

first imposed upon our business life now have got to go. Things are not always what they seem to be.

A story is told of Irving Cobb. They got him on a horse. He had a beautiful silver mounted saddle. He rode for a couple of hours. A friend said to him, "Mr. Cobb, what a beautiful silver saddle you have."

He said, "It may be a beautiful silver saddle to you, but to me it is just a chafing dish."

Obstacles Must Be Removed

What are the obstacles and handicaps and restrictions which must be removed?

First, taxation. We must have a taxation that allows incentive again, incentive to risk, to build new business, to create job opportunities.

Second, we must have a political atmosphere in which capital formation can take place. If we want a fourth more jobs, there must be a fourth more capital in this country. Let's set up a system where there will be a backer for every inventor, where there will be a financial sponsor for every returned soldier who wants to start his own business. Let's make it so attractive that the billions of dollars of bonds that are now in the hands of our people will find their way into new business enterprise, into new investments to create jobs, rather than just be spent for consumer goods.

Third, we must have a realistic Federal labor policy. Not under the civil war that now exists can management and men work out a better America. There must be conditions for coöperation, and controlled production must pass back to the hands of management.

Fourth, there must be a realistic social security program. To be sure, the proper use of the insurance principle to level off the ups and downs of business, is sound. But let's do away with fantastic promises that only do harm.

And lastly, bureaucracy must go. The American people won't settle just for material needs like cattle in a pasture. They want opportunity to progress, to be something, to be someone, to get ahead in the world.

To be sure, we want the policemen out on the street. We feel security when proper regulations take care of us. But we don't want a bureaucratic policeman in the house telling mother when to feed the baby.

There Must be Public Understanding

Now gentlemen, all this ambitious program is worthless unless the people understand it. This is a way to a better America, but we must make it so plain and simple that all good citizens understand it.

Through simple explanations and stories, we must show the American people that we can have a better America if we clear the decks. Let me tell you a story that illustrates this problem.

Come with me, in your mind's eye, to the football field of postwar

economy. We will go into the great stadium where the game of postwar jobs is to be played. In the stands are the American people. They want to see a winning game, with the ball carried over the goal to a better America and jobs for all. The American people own this ball park. They sit in the stands, impatient for the game to be played.

The home team down on the left is warming up. What is the home team? It is the business team of America. Management is the backfield, Labor is the line. And they are learning that it takes coöperation, that they must run together under the same rules in order to win this game.

They have not always been a good team, gentlemen. I remember a game that was played in which the line sat down. We lost that game. I remember a game that was played in which the line slowed down and no progress was made. I remember a game when the backfield mixed signals. No gentlemen, your American team of management and men is learning that they must run at the same time, under the same signals, and with the same objective.

Across the field, at the other end, you see the opposing team. It is a strong team. It has won many games all around the world. It is the team of poverty, unemployment, disease, misunderstanding; the team of the forces of collectivism that would control your life and mine.

Teamwork Needed to Win the Game

We need a lot of training in teamwork to win this game. The opponents have come to this country and it is our greatest game. And how we need the support of the fans in the stands when we play it!

And over here, gentlemen, on the left of us there are benches with a lot of people sitting on them. Who are they? Why, those are the ground keepers. Those are the hired men who work for the American people, who own the ball park. They are the Congress, the Administration; the ground keepers, the umpires, and the referees. What are their duties? Their duties are to keep the field cleared so that we can play, to give us fair and good umpiring, and to give us good rules, and a good administration of those rules.

Have we always had good rules? We didn't have any rules when this game began. You could kick a man or trip him or push his nose in the grass. But we learned as years went by that it was a better game if fair rules were made. And so we have them today.

Have all past games been umpired fairly? Not always. I remember a game when there was a fumble and the umpire grabbed the ball and ran in the wrong direction. I remember another game when one of our boys was making a long run and the referee went out and tackled him and stopped the progress. There hasn't always been good umpiring.

I remember a game in which the rules were changed right in the middle of the game, and the business backfield didn't know where they were going.

Let's get together and play the game. The crowd yells, "Carry the ball of jobs over the goal!" The team lines up. The signals are called and the ball is passed in the backfield, and men start down the field after the opposing team.

Tax Barrier Halts Game

And, lo and behold, they come to a brick wall, eight feet high. And a little sign on the brick wall says, "The Federal Tax System." The game stops and the bewildered players turn to the American people in the stands and say, "How did this thing get here?"

And up speak the ground keepers and say, "Why, we thought the owners wanted it. We built it there."

So we say to the American people, who own the park, "Get this wall down low enough so we can jump over it, and management and men will get on with the game of building a better America."

So we start the game over. The ball is passed. The signals are given. The line in the backfield runs over the wall and down the field.

And, lo and behold, they come to a ditch, ten feet deep. And a little sign says, "All the Rules and Regulations that Control Investments and Securities."

We say, "How did this ditch get here?"

The ground keepers reply, "Why, we put it there. We thought the owners wanted it."

The team says to the American people, "Clear the field. Fill it up so we can get on with the game."

And so we wait while the ditch is filled.

We start the game over. The ball is passed and off we go, over the wall and across the ditch. And, lo and behold, we come to a briar patch, six feet deep. The little sign there says, "Federal Labor Policies—N.L.R.B., W.L.B. All the Rules and Regulations That Make It Difficult to Team Up an American Industry."

Watch the quarterback as he grabs the ball. He runs into the briar patch and he is torn and scratched. The game stops. It takes both teams to get him out of the briars. And by the time we get him out, he has lost his shirt.

One would think this game of American business was an obstacle race instead of a football game. There isn't a man in this room who doesn't recognize these obstacles, because every one of you has been in the briar patch and you have left your shirts there.

We say, "How did this briar patch get here?"

And the ground keepers say, "Why, we put it there. We thought the owners wanted it. We just planted little bits of bushes. We didn't realize they would get so big."

Our Team is Out To Win

But the players in the backfield are rugged individualists. Once the

obstacles are removed and the field is cleared, nothing is going to stop our team from making a successful business. Nothing is going to stop us from making jobs for Americans.

That is industry's story. Our goal is a better America with jobs and opportunities for all. And there is only one way to win: A hard, fighting team of free Americans well trained, under free institutions, with complete freedom of coöperation for full production. The field must be cleared of obstacles, where a game of risk can be played, boldly, daringly, with all the skill and energy that has made America great. And there must be fair and honest umpiring, and fair rules, so that we may get on with the game.

Gentlemen, all America today turns to you for leadership in this fight for a better America. It is a challenge to you. We can have a great America if we will make it so.

Federal Aid for the Planning of State and Local Postwar Public Works

PHILIP B. FLEMING, Major General, U.S.A., Administrator, Federal Works Agency, Washington, D. C.

THE Federal Works Agency is authorized by Title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 to make advances of Federal funds to state and local governments in order to encourage them to make provision for advance planning of public works, not to include housing. An appropriation for this purpose, postponed by the 78th Congress, will be considered by the 79th Congress, which meets in January, 1945.

In authorizing the FWA to make Federal advances for public works planning by state and local governments, Congress was acting on the following premises. Business and governmental leaders agree generally that, in the postwar period in this country, about 7 to 10 million more jobs will be required than were available in 1940, and that an annual postwar national income of about 150 billion dollars will be required to prevent large-scale unemployment. Since construction activities normally account for about 10 percent of the national income, we should therefore need about 15 billion dollars' worth of construction a year in the postwar period. This is a larger volume of construction than the annual average in the late 20's, which was about 11 billion dollars.

Public works, it is estimated, should account for about one-third of the total volume of construction, or approximately 5 billion dollars a year in terms of costs. The problem then boils down to whether this volume of public works will be planned and ready for construction in the first postwar year. Examination of the present situation shows that the Federal Government on purely Federal projects will provide about half a billion dollars' worth of construction a year for several postwar years.

In addition, Federal-aid and state highway construction will probably amount to a billion dollars a year for three years. That gives us a billion and a half dollars' worth of construction for the first postwar year, leaving about 3 and a half billions to be provided by other state and local public works, to make up the 5 billions needed.

However, in order to get construction amounting to 3 and a half billions in the first postwar year, plans will have to be ready for about 6 billion dollars' worth of additional public works. The reason for this is that the construction started in the first postwar year cannot all be scheduled to begin early enough in that year to permit it to be finished in that year. A good deal of it will extend into the second postwar year. Particularly in cities, large projects and related small projects that must be constructed in series, will extend into the second postwar year and will provide much of their employment then rather than earlier. It is therefore estimated that it will take plans for at least 6 billion dollars' worth of state and local construction to ensure 3 and a half billion dollars' worth of construction being done in the first postwar year.

State and local governments last July had plans for nearly 3 billion dollars' worth of public works, of which about 1 billion dollars' worth were in the completed stage of preparation, and of which 1.8 billion dollars' worth were in a stage nearing completion. Some plans were not reported at that time. The total of these plans, all such as might possibly be completed by July, 1945, would amount to 3.5 billions. This would leave 2.5 billions to be provided by additional state and local plans. We particularly need to have state and local plans developed in those areas and localities in which hardly any postwar construction of public works has been planned at all.

It is for the purpose of stimulating this additional state and local planning, so as to ensure adequate actual construction of public works in the first postwar year, that Federal advances for this purpose have been authorized by Congress.

Detailed figures on the extent of state and local planning for postwar public works were gathered last summer by the Federal Works Agency, in collaboration with the Bureau of the Census. These data were tabulated and summarized in a report made by the FWA to the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, of the House of Representatives. The report indicated that, as of July 1, 1944, planning of public works was in general very inadequate. The planning that had been done was found to have been concentrated in a relatively few governmental units.

For example, two-thirds of the completed planning (for about one billion dollars' worth of public works altogether) was reported by the local and state governments of only five States—New York, California, Illinois, Michigan, and Ohio; and about two-fifths of all such completed planning was found concentrated in five cities—New York, Chicago,

Philadelphia, Detroit and Los Angeles. Of the 45 state governments reporting, 44 had plans in some stage of preparation, but only 28 had any plans in the completed stage; while of 81 cities of over 100,000 population reporting plans, only 58 had any plans in the completed stage.

Many governmental units have plans in an incomplete stage of preparation. The bulk of these plans are merely in the "idea" stage, but there is a considerable volume of plans on which some preliminary work has been done, short of making the final blue-prints. Some progress in planning has undoubtedly been made in the six months since July, 1944, but a great deal more remains to be done. A large number of States and localities reported that they lacked the authority or the funds necessary for bringing their plans to completion. In many of these areas it is legally impossible to pay for plan preparation until after the sale of bond issues for construction. Only a few state governments have provided any assistance to local governments for the advance planning of public works, or for local over-all planning.

Thus, the purpose behind the Federal advances now authorized is to help States and localities overcome some of the obstacles in preparing a full and detailed "shelf" of plans for postwar public works. An appropriation of 100 million dollars, for example, would provide for the planning of 2 billion dollars' worth of state and local public works, planning costs being estimated as 5 percent of total project costs.

The authorizing legislation provides that 90 percent of the Federal funds appropriated for planning shall be apportioned among the States in accordance with their 1940 population. The remainder is to be distributed at the discretion of the Federal Works Administrator. Discretionary allotments can be used, among other purposes, to make allowance for changes in population since 1940.

The 1944 report of the FWA to the Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning mentioned previously makes clear the types of projects which States and localities are desirous of planning. With the proposed Federal advances for planning, the state and local governments would complete their blue-prints on projects that have been deferred during the war or that will be required to meet postwar needs—such as water supply and sewer and sewage disposal systems, and schools and other public buildings.

The Federal Works Agency expects to decentralize the administration of this program as far as possible. There will be a field staff located in the States, which will confer with state and local officials, learn their needs, advise them on applications, and make recommendations to the FWA's division offices as to which projects are most eligible to receive planning advances. In the division offices the planning funds apportioned for each State will be apportioned among projects within the State. Except with respect to applications for planning advances above a certain figure, for large projects, which will be referred to Washington, it is expected that

final decisions on applications can be made in the division offices.

As soon as Congress makes planning funds available to the FWA, application forms will be issued for the use of state and local officials. Each application will necessarily relate to an individual project, and advances cannot be made for any over-all planning not tied to a particular project. The application will include a promise to repay the advance if and when the project is placed under construction. No advances will be made to reimburse governmental units for planning already performed at their own expense. It is not intended to make advances to governmental units that have sufficient funds and authority for their planning but are not making the fullest use of these resources.

The authorizing legislation requires that advances be made only for the planning of projects that conform to an over-all plan approved by competent authority. Thus, for example, a sewer project must fit into a municipality's regularly adopted program for the necessary expansion of its sewer facilities.

Self-liquidating projects should have the highest priority for planning advances. Necessary utilities, including power, water supply and sewer projects, should have preference over public buildings; and, ordinarily, stadia, parks, and other recreational facilities should be low in order of preference. Advances must be limited to projects on which construction can be started as soon as the war ends or as soon thereafter as labor and materials are available.

The FWA, in the course of administering these planning funds, will come into possession of current general information on state and local planning of postwar public works, with respect to types, estimated costs, and the status of plan preparation. This information will be compiled and summarized and reported from time to time to Congress, and it should be of value as showing general progress in this important activity.

The purpose of this program is to assist the construction industry in providing its full share of postwar employment. The construction industry has been harder hit than any other by war-time conditions; the number of construction contracting businesses declined over 35 percent from 1941 to 1943, and contractors will need public works contracts to put the construction industry quickly back on its feet. Although the immediate concern of the FWA is with the planning of public works for construction in the first postwar year, a shelf of public works should be continuously in preparation for successive postwar years, and it should be possible to advance or delay the construction of some of these public works in accordance with actual postwar conditions.

This program of Federal advances is designed only to assist, not to finance completely, the state and local planning of postwar public works. A great deal of such planning must necessarily be done by state and local governments without Federal advances, and all governmental units should proceed as far as they can on their own resources.

A New Highway Program

H. S. FAIRBANK, Deputy Commissioner, Public Roads Administration, Washington, D. C.

ON JUNE 2, in the House of Representatives, a bill was introduced with the unanimous support of the Roads Committee, the purpose of which was to prepare and definitely provide for the participation of the Federal Government in a new program of road and street construction in the first 3 years after the war. A similar bill was introduced in the Senate on August 22, and from these two bills there developed an agreed bill which, with the President's approval on December 20, became the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

It had been more than 4 years since the passage of the last prewar authorization for Federal-aid highways. In that period other Federal highway appropriations had been made, but the purpose of the other appropriations was to provide for the urgent highway needs of war, and their expenditure was sharply restricted to that purpose.

The Road Act of 1944 looks to the future era of peace—the long era of peace, we fervently hope—which is to follow the present ordeal. It promises the aid of the Federal Government in the first years of a new period of road and street construction which must and, I firmly believe, will raise the facility of highway transport by 1960 as far above the level of 1940 as by that year it had been raised above the level of 1920.

States, counties, and cities have been awaiting a definition of the Federal contribution to the new program before deciding upon the amount of their necessary supplementary provision. It may be of interest therefore to review the salient provisions of the Act.

It authorizes a total Federal appropriation of $1,500,000,000, expendable in equal annual installments of $500,000,000 in the first 3 postwar years.

The first year's authorization will be apportioned within 30 days of the passage of the Act and will be immediately available for allotment to approved projects, such allotments constituting a contractual obligation of the United States to pay for work performed. The survey and planning of projects may be undertaken at once with Federal participation in the cost when the authorized funds are appropriated. Rights-of-way for programmed projects may be acquired without delay and with the assurance of eventual Federal participation in their cost. For construction the first $500,000,000 will be available for expenditure in the first Federal fiscal year ending after the termination of the war emergency or at such other date as Congress shall determine.

The second installment of $500,000,000 will be available for expenditure in the next fiscal year—the fiscal year beginning after the end of the war, and the third installment will be available for the fiscal year next succeeding. According to the Act, each of these installments (the

second and the third) will be apportioned on or before January 1st next preceding the beginning of the fiscal year for which it is made available, and each will be available for contractual obligation immediately upon its apportionment.

More positively than any previous legislation, this Act provides for Federal participation in the improvement of roads and streets of all classes, *including roads and streets in urban areas.* This it does by earmarking parts of each annual installment for expenditure on the Federal-aid highway system, on a secondary Federal-aid system, and on a system of principal Federal-aid routes in urban areas.

For expenditure on the Federal-aid highway system, either within or without cities, the Act earmarks $225,000,000 of each $500,000,000 annual installment, to be apportioned among the States according to their area, road mileage, and total population by a formula giving equal weight to each factor. For expenditure on the system of secondary roads to be selected, it earmarks $150,000,000 of each installment, to be apportioned according to a formula differing from that above described only in substitution of the rural population of the States for their total population. This leaves $125,000,000 of each year's installment which is earmarked for expenditure on principal Federal-aid routes in urban areas, and is to be apportioned according to the population of the States resident in municipalities and other urban places of 5,000 or more.

Of several other provisions I shall refer here to two only. By those who take the longer view, these two provisions are regarded as the most significant features of the Act.

One of these provisions directs the highway departments of the several States to join in the designation of a National System of Interstate Highways, limited to 40,000 miles in the United States as a whole. The character and extent of the system to be designated, as defined in the Act, are identical with the character and approximate extent of the interregional highway system recommended by the National Interregional Highway Committee and the Commissioner of Public Roads, and described in the report entitled, "Interregional Highways." The report, as you will recall, was forwarded by the President, with his endorsement, to the Congress on January 12, 1944.

Although the Roads Committee has preferred another name for the system, this Act authorizes and directs the taking of the first step necessary to give effect to the recommendations of the Interregional Highways report. This provision is regarded as of more far-reaching effect than any other measure incorporated in the Act.

The second most significant provision of the Act is attached to the authorization for secondary roads. It specifies that the funds earmarked for secondary roads shall be expended on a system of such roads selected by the state highway departments in coöperation with county and local road officials and the Commissioner of Public Roads.

The great significance of these two provisions lies in the fact that they complete the foundation for a balanced highway program under joint auspices of the Federal and state governments. The Federal highway program in the past has been centered mainly on the development of the Federal-aid system. With few exceptions the programs of the States have been centered upon the state highway system. Both of these systems are composed of main roads. Although there have been previous Federal appropriations for secondary roads, and although an effort has been made by administrative action to direct the expenditure of these funds to a well-considered system, a secondary road system has never been legally established. Here for the first time is a provision in Federal law for the designation of a system of secondary roads, coördinated with the regular Federal-aid system. And most important, here also is a provision for the designation of the major interregional routes of the Federal-aid system in such a manner as to make them eligible for preferential improvement into a modernized express facility.

The Act will continue the regular Federal-aid system; will coordinate with it a secondary system designated appropriately by the States in coöperation with the counties and local governments; and will make the major routes of the Federal-aid system eligible for the preferential treatment they justify, placing particular emphasis where it should be—on the improvement of the urban sections of these major routes.

So we have in this Act a definition of the Federal Government's intention to coöperate in an early postwar operation. And this is important because there must be a beginning. But the Act goes beyond this beginning and lays a new and broad foundation for a long-time Federal-aid program, that is really a new program. It is new in time and new in form, and it is right in emphasis.

The designation of the interstate system will be the inducement and the first means of establishing wherever it is needed—in rural and urban environments alike—a new type of express highway—a type of highway designed especially for the safe and efficient accommodation of the larger arterial flows of traffic.

In cities the building of these new express arteries, affording the means of relieving other streets of the press of centerbound and transcity traffic, will be the first step toward a desirable classification of streets into ways of through and local usage, and may conceivably give the first positive impetus toward the accomplishment of plans for the gradual remodeling of the existing amorphous city structure into a structure of neighborhood and functional cells, logically and naturally arranged.

Between the cities, in rural areas, and especially in the suburban zones where rural highway traffic reaches its highest peaks, the building of these special facilities for the accommodation of express movement,

will not only speed this important element of highway traffic, but should go far toward the elimination of the causes of the more numerous and serious accidents and so reduce the lamentable toll of death and destruction hitherto claimed by congested highways of mixed local and arterial usage. It is conceivable, that by setting apart recognized avenues of major interstate travel and promptly fitting these arteries, in their roadways and bridges, in one State as in another, for the accommodation of vehicles of reasonable size, weight, and speed capacity, it may be one means, through application of agreed uniform limitations of size, weight and speed to these routes at least in all States alike, of affording a solution of the troublesome problem of interstate barriers.

If the local road authorities are assured of having a voice in the designation of a secondary Federal-aid road system, this measure should go far toward the relief of strains unfortunately existing in the relations between these authorities and the state highway departments, and bring the two administrative groups into common agreement upon a plan of orderly development of the more important farm-to-market roads as an integrated part of the improved highway system. In dealing with roads of this class, wise selection of roads to be improved from the vast mileage existing—a selection taking due account of social and efficient land-use objectives—is still a cardinal principle to be observed, if in reasonable time the expenditure of available funds is to accomplish the greatest general benefits.

The Act of Congress approved on December 20, 1944, makes possible at the sessions of the state legislatures in 1945, the enactment of considerable state legislation that will be needed before the postwar construction of really modern highways can begin. For instance, about 30 States need legislation to enable them to adopt the limited-access type of design recommended for the interregional or interstate highways.

Better right-of-way acquisition laws are a further need in many States. The process of land acquisition usually is too slow and cumbersome. Furthermore, most state laws prohibit the taking of right-of-way width additional to that required for the physical improvements immediately planned, yet the proposed standards for the interregional highways call for immediate acquisition of sufficient right-of-way to meet the anticipated need for future widening, to protect the express character of the roads, and to permit the screening out of unsightliness.

Another problem which the state legislatures need to solve is that of more effective coöperation between state highway departments and city administrations. Particularly there is need for some better means of dealing with the complicated situation in metropolitan areas which consist of several cities, or of a major city and numerous surrounding satellite communities. Perhaps the creation of an over-all authority would be desirable in these complex urban areas to coördinate the interregional

and other express routes with the metropolitan street and highway plan. If this is the solution, it will have to be legislatively provided.

If in the planning of the new highway program there is a proper recognition of the new elements that should distinguish it as a refining, adjusting, standardizing and ultimately adequate program from the necessarily provisional character of the earlier pioneer program, that recognition will be due in no small measure to the wise initiative of the President in appointing the National Interregional Highway Committee and to the Interregional Highway report recently produced by that Committee. The distinguished Chairman of your Board of Directors, Mr. Frederic A. Delano, was a member of the Committee. Mr. Harland Bartholomew of this city, one of the country's outstanding leaders in city planning, was another. To these two gentlemen we are indebted for much of the foresighted guidance and counsel provided by the report.

Briefly the report recommends:

(1) That Congress immediately provide for the designation of an interregional system.

(2) That plans be developed for postwar construction of the system to the highest modern standards, on locations and within rights-of-way where they will have the prospect of long and beneficial service.

(3) That the initial mileage be limited to about 40,000 miles of the routes and their urban connections which will serve a larger volume of traffic than any other larger or smaller network.

(4) That since cities and metropolitan areas are the source and destination of a major part of all traffic, the proposed system of interregional highways, within the limit of the mileage adopted, be located to connect as many as possible of the larger urban centers regionally and interregionally.

(5) That since short-range movement is the predominant element of traffic on all roads, deviation be made from ideally direct lines of connection between the larger regional centers in order to connect en route as many as practicable of the smaller urban centers of at least 10,000 population.

The proposal of an interregional system (or a National System of Interstate Highways) is really only a recognition that the roads that comprise the system are the roads most in need of modernization. The unsatisfactory condition of the sections of interregional highways approaching and traversing cities in particular is the reason for the great emphasis placed by the report on the city sections as the very most needed of all most needed improvements.

Built according to the construction standards recommended, the interregional system would provide or allow for the subsequent provision of facilities capable of serving safely and efficiently a mixed traffic of passenger automobiles, motor busses, and various types of trucks, in the volumes expected 20 years from the date of construction.

All roadways and structures on the system, in their immediate design or a feasible modification later, would provide in all seasons for the passage and support of vehicles and combinations of vehicles of specified width, height, length, and axle load in the frequency and distribution of

these dimensions and weights to be expected in 20 years from the date of construction. The specified axle load is 18,000 pounds on pneumatic tires; the width 96 inches; height, 12½ feet; and over-all length, 35 feet for single vehicles and up to 60 feet for combinations.

Constructed to the standards recommended, all rural sections of the system in flat topography would be designed at all points and in all respects for safe travel by passenger vehicles at a speed of not less than 75 miles an hour and by truck and tractor combinations at a speed of not less than 60 miles an hour, in all seasons. In difficult terrain, the design speed might be reduced somewhat. The design speed for urban sections would be 50 miles an hour for passenger cars and 35 miles an hour for trucks in all seasons.

Furthermore, the interregional system would be designed with a sufficient number of traffic lanes and other facilities so that except at infrequent peak hours when traffic density might interfere, the average running speed would not need to be reduced at any time or in any season to less than 50 miles an hour on rural sections or to less than 40 miles an hour on urban sections.

All rural and urban sections of the interregional system would be legally established as limited-access highways, and actually so limited as need requires. There would be no railroad crossings at grade. No highway crossings at grade would exist on any of the heavily traveled rural sections, nor street or highway crossings at grade on urban sections. Wherever the volume of traffic necessitated four or more lanes of pavement, two distinct one-way roads would be constructed, unfettered by previous conceptions of divided-highway design of fixed and uniform cross section.

Alinement, curvature, and sight distance would be adapted to high-speed travel. Shoulders would be 10 feet wide to accommodate standing vehicles. Grades in relatively level country and in cities usually would not exceed three percent.

Rural right-of-way would be of ample width for immediate construction and future widening, varying from about 225 feet to 300 feet. Urban right-of-way would be ample to accommodate the facilities required.

To avoid frequent intersection with other streets or highways, urban sections of the interregional system would be depressed or elevated or both, preferably depressed. Wherever necessary for the service of property, local service streets would be provided at each side of urban sections of the interregional system.

These are a few of the report's more significant proposals, which I mention here primarily to excite your interest in reading the report itself, which has been published and is available without charge, by application to the Public Roads Administration.

Such an interregional or interstate system will not be developed by the Federal Government alone or even in its entirety by the Federal and

1168374

state governments. *Local governments, especially those of the cities, will have important shares of the responsibility for an harmonious and balanced development.* It is desirable, therefore, that there exist a determination on the part of all authorities and by the public generally that whatever work is henceforth done on routes generally conforming to the selected system shall be done in accordance with agreed high standards approximating those which have been proposed.

It is highly important moreover, that such a determination be taken now or with the least possible delay in order that plans now being made shall reflect in the character of their provisions the intended purpose. Unless this be done there is danger that plans now being made for execution as part of a large immediate postwar program may result in a substantial volume of inadequate construction, inadvisedly located, and so constitute a new and large reinvestment in early obsolescence.

To those who doubt on grounds of financial feasibility whether we can afford the modernization of our highway system which the Interregional Highway report proposes, who say in effect: "Yes, this all sounds very attractive; we recognize the need, but can we accomplish the ambitious ends proposed?" it might be answered that a better question would be: "Dare we fail?"

One answer is that if we fail, we will continue to pay heavily in lives. In the 15 years before the war, more than half a million people were killed on our obsolete highways and streets. Do we want to round that out to a million by the end of another 15 years? Year by year during the 15 years before the war, our highways and streets became more obsolete, and year by year, with some exceptions, traffic fatalities increased. The 25,000 traffic deaths in 1927 had increased to 40,000 in 1941. Will we reduce this death toll by endlessly repeating "Drive carefully" slogans? Or will we adopt more positive means, among them that of designing the highways to eliminate the causes of accidents? We all know the answer, but a few figures will verify it.

The death rate on all highways was averaging about 12 fatalities per hundred million vehicle-miles during the years immediately before the war. The same rate occurred on a section of U S 1 paralleling the Merritt Parkway in Connecticut during a 3½-year period ending last July. This section of U S 1 may be accurately described as obsolete.

The nearby 37-mile Merritt Parkway, on the other hand is a modern facility built to much the same high standards as are recommended by the Interregional Highways report. In a 5½-year period ending with 1943, its accident rate was less than 4 fatalities per hundred million vehicle-miles. Four on the modern Merritt Parkway; 12 on obsolete U S 1. Modern design only one-third as hazardous!

Dare we fail to modernize our highways and streets? Years ago, Thos. H. MacDonald gave succinct expression to the answer, when he said that we pay for modern highway improvements whether we have them

or not, and we pay less if we have them than if we have not. That applies as well to the modernization work of the future, designed to take us out of the present muddle of congestion, as it did to the early work directed to the more limited objective of just getting us out of the mud. And it takes into account intangibles as well as dollars-and-cents economics.

The ideas expressed in the "Interregional Highways" report have had a remarkable acceptance. Highway authorities and others have expressed their approval in words, and the state highway departments have demonstrated their concurrence by their undertakings in the advance-planning program. A very substantial part of the advance-planning projects which they have proposed are located on the Committee's recommended interregional system, and will be planned substantially as recommended, even though the recommended system has not yet been designated either as an interregional system or, as the Congressional Committee would prefer to term it: A National System of Interstate Highways.

Urban Redevelopment Legislation

ALFRED BETTMAN, Cincinnati, Ohio

THE leading objective of what we call urban redevelopment legislation is the replanning and rebuilding of blighted (including slum) areas. The decadences and obsolescence which are responsible for the blight are not restricted to the buildings; for if that were the case the owners would rebuild without public aid or participation. But there is the obsolescence of the lot and ownership layout which does not accord with up-to-date types of buildings; and there is the deeper but no less inescapable city planning obsolescence; by which is meant that the particular types of functional uses for which the existing buildings and lots are used have ceased to be appropriate, socially or economically, in their present location; as, for instance, the continuation of crowded workers' homes after the workplaces have moved to a long distance away.

Consequently, if the redevelopment is to be intelligent and produce the social and economic benefits justifying the investments, and is not to be the beginning of another unnecessarily rapid era of blight, we must pose the questions of, gather and analyze the data relating to and make something better than hunches and opportunistic decisions on the redevelopment plans. We should adopt and follow procedures for painstaking and genuine conclusions as to what is the appropriate future layout and functional uses of the various blighted areas. But as an intelligent determination of the function of a part of an organism can never be made without a visualization of the functions of the other parts, these procedures must include that which we call master planning. In other words, there should be, and the enabling legislation should provide for,

such a degree of the determination of the land uses of the whole city or the whole urban area (that is, the whole urbanized and to be urbanized area) as will give some degree of assurance of the soundness of the plan for the redevelopment of any particular area. Nobody, public or private, ought to be allowed to dislocate the development of the city and thus condemn the city to the economic and social losses of poor planning by arbitrarily picking out an area and its uses without this master planning guidance.

This means that some degree of master planning should, if not mandatorily prescribed, at least be directed in the urban redevelopment statute. Master planning is the function of the planning agency, whatever form that planning agency may happen to have in any particular city or State.(1) The New York redevelopment corporations statute, which has been rather mechanically followed in many of the States, requires the redevelopment plan of an area to be checked up against the master plan, "if any."(2) This is too loose. There ought not be any "if any" about it.(3) Provisions which prescribe nothing more than that the proposed redevelopment plan of an area is to be checked up for conformance with the master plan, if any, contain the fallacy that the master plan is at any time a rigid completed tool which mechanically can answer the question whether the proposed design of the area conforms to good planning of the city. We ought all know by this time that such is not the nature of the master plan, which is something more than a map, and should be a growing collection of data, analyses, standards, which can never at a moment's notice contain the answer to all the master planning questions presented by any particular project. So, at the very least, the planning agency ought always be given the opportunity to investigate and study whether any proposed area plan is sound from the point of view of the relations of the functional uses of that area to the future functional uses of both the surrounding areas and the other parts of the urban territory; and the legislation should at least direct that the planning agency have sufficient master planning to enable it to determine and present these relationships.

In short, the enabling legislation ought to make possible and to some degree prescribe a free, careful and adequate study by the planning agency of the master planning factors in the planning of the area, as distinguished from the lip service or mechanical conception which might be encouraged by prescriptions of the New York type.(4) Provisions for this better planning procedure have been incorporated in the bill for the urban redevelopment of the District of Columbia, introduced in the

(1) Missouri statute gives all planning functions to a board of public service, which is inconsistent with the master planning concept.

(2) Copied in Missouri statute; also Illinois statute; also Michigan statute.

(3) The Kansas statute omits the "if any."

(4) Kentucky statute mentions city planning commission, but really gives no planning questions to the commission.

United States Senate by Senator Capper (S-1930) and in the House of Representatives by Mr. Randolph (HR-4847).

For similar reasons it would be better policy if the planning agency be given not only the opportunity but also the power and duty to initiate the redevelopment design of the area itself, that is, of the particular piece of territory which is to be the subject of a redevelopment project. This should include the site or use layout, that is, the approximate portions of the area allotted to the different functional uses,—habitation, recreation, education, trade, business and so on,—including limits of population density and building intensity.

We know from everyday experience that when an agency is restricted to a "yes" or "no" on a plan made by somebody else, behind which plan lies all the pressures of powerful economic and financial groups and of political expediencies, the "yes or no" body is in a rather weak position for capturing for the public those economic and social values for which sound planning standards and methods are essential. As a matter of fact, in all public action the first initiation or stimulus is apt to come from private persons or interests. The history of any street would probably show that the first stimulus for a street in the proposed general location came from private or civic sources. But in order to pass intelligently upon any design made by others, the body which has the province of passing on it must make more or less of a design of its own as a tool for checking the quality of the submitted plan. So whether the planning agency be conceived as the initiator of the redevelopment design of the area or as a body with the responsibility for approving that design, it should be required to make a plan of the area including at least the general features of the layout, such as land-use distribution, location and extent of public utilities and facilities and population density and building intensity standards. The greater the degree of initiative assigned to the planning agency the more likely will be the realization of the economic and social goods and values. Here again a comparison is suggested between the type of measure illustrated by the abovementioned District of Columbia bill and the New York type of statute, the former being based upon the thought that the future of the city will benefit from the strengthening of the part the public planning agency is to play, as contrasted with the weakness of a mere mechanical and narrow responsibility.(1) Of course in New York and in most States, the general planning statutes give the planning agencies the right to make plans. But the important thing in redevelopment legislation is that the exercise of this right shall be required as a part of the procedure for redevelopment.

(1) Kentucky or Michigan statute, like many of the measures modeled on the New York law, gives a rather skimpy, mechanical function to the planning agency. In Maryland statute, doubtful if city planning factors are given any influential part. In the Indiana statute, city planning factors are given no part or agency. None of the existing redevelopment corporation statutes direct any redevelopment area planning by the planning agency.

Passing mention might be made of the provisions of some of the present statutes to the effect that approval or disapproval of a plan of an area may be subjected to court review.(1) It is difficult to imagine any kind of an organism less qualified and equipped to plan a city than is a court.

So far the word "housing" has not occurred in this paper. From both the point of view of soundness of a redevelopment and for the long-run advantage of housing itself, that is, furnishing a good standard of habitation for all the people, the assumption that housing is necessarily the appropriate use of every area now blighted or the still more rigid assumption that the redevelopment of an area now devoted to the habitations of the low-income group shall be redeveloped for the same kind of group, are assumptions in which tragic consequences lurk. Yet these are the assumptions upon which many of the provisions of the existing statutes are based, and that sort of approach should be exercised as soon as possible.

Habitation will, of course, be the predominant use of the redeveloped areas as it is of most other areas of a city. In other words, habitation uses more territory than does any other type of use, public or private. But obviously there can be no intelligent planning of the city if the study of the problems begins with the answers. The objective is to learn the best use of every part of the city in the light of the design of the whole; and, as the type of habitation based on occupants' income or any other factor must be coördinated and correlated with the street system, with the recreation system, with the school system, with the location of business centers, of railroads, of industry and of the locations of other types of habitation, planning for the future should not be weighted down at the very start with devotion to the past. Indeed, some of the obsolescence which is one of the sources of the blight is the inappropriateness of the existing uses, made inappropriate by the economic and social trends which must be accorded a strong if not dominant influence in the process of the planning.

The assumption that old blighted areas shall in the future, as in the unfortunate present, be for the income class now living there, regardless of where the industries are to be and the railroad terminals are to be and the business center is, is obviously not conducive to good redevelopment. Yet that is just what some of the redevelopment statutes do assume;(2) indeed, some of the statutes are really housing and not urban redevelopment statutes.(3)

So much for the planning; and now to the carrying out.

The redevelopment area will be turned over to a redevelopment *entrepreneur* for the carrying out of the redevelopment plan; and in the

(1) Illinois statute; also Indiana statute which can hardly be considered as a planning statute.

(2) Illinois statute. (3) The Maryland and Indiana statutes, for instance; and, substantially, the later New York statute.

formulation of statutory provisions on this phase of the legislation, some of the questions which arise are: shall the area be leased to the developer on a long-term lease or sold to the developer? Shall the lease or sale be of the area as an entirety, or shall the initial disposition of the area be permitted to be by separate sales or leases of separate lots or parcels? And shall the legislation itself seek to decide the policy of restricting redevelopment to what is called private enterprise or also include public housing?

The plan will need modification from time to time and not merely during the period of construction but also afterwards; for, as the plan will include specifications of uses of land and buildings and bulk of buildings and extent of open spaces which are to be binding upon the area until authoritatively changed, the plan is not accomplished with the completion of construction. The idea that the plan is accomplished with the completion of construction and therefore reliance can thenceforth be exclusively placed upon zoning and police power is a dangerous fallacy lurking in some of the statutes.(1) As justifications for modifications will become apparent both during the period of construction and thereafter, procedure for modification should be provided with the planning agency having the same part to perform as in the original plan.

Obviously the approved area plan should be carried out and the redevelopment corporation and all its successors in title be obligated so to do. In respect to this most of the existing statutes are rather vague or weak.(2)

The enforcement of the plan will not be easy. Some of the statutes prescribe that the developer shall give a bond. Any experienced lawyer knows how feeble a bond is as a mode of enforcement of complex and continuous obligations. The plan can be made to run with the land similar to private covenants; but that would not dispose of the problem of modifications, and litigation is at best a clumsy mode of enforcing complex and continuous obligations. If the community retain the status of owner, the protection of the plan is easier and likely to be more effective. That is the advantage of leasing the area as compared with the community's parting with all title. However, it is doubtful whether this country is ready for a policy of extensive land ownership by the public, except as a part of the process of assembling the land for disposition to private owners or special public corporations. The chances are that, despite the benefits of a lease policy, the authority of the city to sell the area as well as to lease it will be included in every redevelopment statute enacted during the present era. Where, as in the typical statute today, the property is originally acquired by or for the redevelopment corporation, this problem of sale or lease is not permitted to arise.

(1) Illinois statute; Wisconsin statute. Some of the statutes, Kansas and Michigan for instance, fix a limited period (20) years for public approval of modification. (2) New York, Michigan, etc., etc.

Owing to the difficulties of enforcing the plan against a multitude of lessees or owners, surely the lease or sale of the area as an entirety is preferable, at least until the stage is reached at which the construction is completed or well along.

As for that "hot potato" of today, private *versus* public housing: for the true-blue city planner it is not a case of how happy he'd be with either were t'other dear charmer away, for he needs them both; that is, his plan will reach fruition through the private enterpriser to the full extent the private enterpriser will go in carrying out the city's plan, and through the public enterpriser for the remainder. The city planner must plan for all the needs of all the people of all the urban area; and he should not be involved in policy determinations which would hamper the comprehensiveness of his planning; and the redevelopment legislation ought not be made the medium for policy determinations which are the province of other classes of legislation. The typical statutes now on the statute books are redevelopment corporation statutes and not urban redevelopment statutes in any comprehensive sense, and do not include the public housing authority as a potential developer.(1) There are pending bills which depart from the concept of the neutrality of the planner, as, for instance a District of Columbia redevelopment bill (not the same one as has been above-mentioned) sponsored by certain anti-public-housing interests and introduced in the Senate by Mr. Tydings (S-1923) and in the House by Mr. Randolph (H.R.-4819), which, though making the city the acquirer and seller or lessor of the land, omits the public housing authority as a potential purchaser or lessee of any area. This departure from sound principle is to be deplored as injecting an irrelevant question of policy and a factor likely to impair the quality of the redevelopment planning.

All measures in this field must necessarily provide for land assembly through the power of purchase and eminent domain. Whether this assembly shall be by the city or the developer is a question which is being more and more resolved in favor of having the city assemble the land, especially that part of it which has to be acquired by eminent domain. The prospective developer will, of course, usually participate in the land assembly directly or indirectly; and indeed provision should be made whereby the owners of the land in any area may organize and put their land into the redevelopment project. But, for both legal and policy reasons, it is well to give the city the province of assembling the land. This would facilitate the opportunity of the community to get good area plans which fit into good master plans, and to stamp the plan upon the area so that, by all the available means for protecting and en-

(1) The Indiana statute is not a redevelopment corporation measure of the N. Y. type; but it limits sales or leases of the area to "private" corporations. The Kentucky statute is limited to the private developer and therefore does not include low-rent housing. The Kansas statute and some of the others are strictly private redevelopment corporation statutes.

forcing the plan, the area's development will contribute to the long-term social and economic welfare of the whole community.

Almost all of the statutes and bills deal more or less with the problem of the regulation by the public of the operations of the redevelopment corporation, administered by some regulatory body generally created in the legislation itself. (1) The kind and degree of regulation will vary in accordance with the character of the special privileges granted to the developer, most of which privileges are intertwined with the mode of the financing of the assembly and disposition of the land of the area. For instance, if tax exemption of one degree or another is granted to the redevelopment corporation, as is the case in the New York statute, obviously limitations of dividends, of capital structure and the like, are more important than if the redevelopment corporation simply becomes the lessee or purchaser of the area at a price less than cost and without tax exemption. The lazy copying by one State of a statute which has been carefully worked out and enacted by another, has its amusing features, as, for instance, some of the statutes which are copies of the New York measure contain the latter's elaborate provisions about redevelopment cost and regulatory system, many of which provisions, in the absence of tax exemption or dividend limitation, have no real function to perform.(2) Integration of the parts of a statute with each other is also a valuable type of integration.

Some of the statutes terminate the regulation of the developer when the construction stage is finished. (Is it ever finished?) This is not sound; for, as has been mentioned above, many of the essential features of the plan survive the construction period. This termination of the regulatory system at the time of the structural completion of the project was the main ground of the invalidation of the Illinois statute by an Illinois Circuit Court.(3)

And now—we come to the very important question of the mode of financing; and it would be well, in the interest of clarity of thinking, to be a little certain as to what it is we are engaged in financing in the type of legislation under discussion. We are not engaged in financing construction. As this construction will be for all kinds of functional uses, public, private and mixed-streets, playgrounds, houses for all the different income groups, shops, public utilities, some industries, etc.—and as every agency, public or private, is governed by statutory provisions of one kind or another which supply it with the power and opportunity to carry on its enterprises, the provisions for financing the construction and improvements will be contained and must be contained in the innumerable statutory measures which relate to and which embody the various

(1) The Wisconsin statute makes the planning commission the regulatory body; hardly an appropriate function for a planning agency.

(2) Missouri statute; Kentucky statute. (3) The New York statute and others which use tax exemption terminate the regulatory period with the end of the tax-exemption period.

public policies on the various subject-matters of the various construction agencies. For instance, the powers and procedures and financing of public housing authorities for building public housing projects constitute the field of public housing legislation, just as the powers and procedures and financing for building streets belong in legislation relating to street construction.

In this paper we are engaged in thinking over that specific type of legislation which is intended to provide the statutory powers and the organization of the powers and the procedure and equipment for the exercise of the powers relating to the acquisition, assembly and disposition of land areas for and subject to redevelopment plans of those areas; and we are now groping for conclusions or experiments on the modes of the financing of this land assembly and land disposition.

This financing problem arises mainly because, to a greater or lesser extent, the cost of the acquisition of the land will or may exceed the price at which the developer can afford to take it over for the planned uses. Unless provision be made for meeting that difference at the time of the acquisition of the land and for carrying that difference until amortized by the proceeds or revenues of the land or other sources, obviously urban redevelopment will either be slowed down or badly done. By badly is meant not in accordance with sound social and economic standards.

Into the discussion of this problem there has entered considerable ethics or rhetoric of ethics or rhetoric of confused ethics: "Shall we bail out the owners of those areas at fictitious values? Should they not stew in their own juice?" The trouble of it is that the rest of us also stew in the same juice, for we pay for the social and economic consequences of the blight. Perhaps the discovery of him who is morally responsible for the difference between what we will call the market value of the blighted area and its use-value for soundly planned use is not a simple task. Perhaps Father Time, perhaps technology, perhaps some forces as uncontrollable as the tides have shared with the blindnesses or the cupidities or the other human frailties of the owners and perhaps also of the rest of us in producing the situation, insofar as it has been produced by human frailties.

At any rate, the community ought not be a slave of the past; and insofar as courts, juries and shrewd city administrators and lawyers cannot write the past so-called values off for us, the better city is too important and the long-run costs of accelerated or preventable blight so far exceeds this difference between acquisition cost and planned land-use value that we must be wise and prudent and not allow ourselves to be paralyzed or tempted to easy but costly opportunisms.

The simplest method of financing is that the difference between the acquisition cost and the disposition value, insofar as it cannot be reduced by the skill with which the enabling legislation is composed and admin-

istered, must be borne by the public for the period and to the extent that it is not amortized by the proceeds of the sale of the areas or the rentals from the leases of the areas.(1) As the Federal Government collects such a large part of the taxes paid by the people of our cities, it would seem practical and just that the Federal Government aid in carrying this burden until the increased revenues from the redevelopment areas cover it, which they might well do if the redevelopment be well planned; that is, the cumulative redevelopment ought to produce revenues which will cumulatively take care of the money advanced for the land assembly. It is for this reason that the Thomas bill, for instance, provides for the pooling of all of the revenues from all of the redeveloped areas; a procedure which corresponds to the sound conception that the redevelopment of one area is a step in the planned development of the whole urban territory.(2)

Owing to the present fashion of antagonism to Federal aid, carrying as it does some degree of Federal supervision, several other modes of financing have been proposed; all of which, be it noted, escape from one kind of Federal aid by providing for some other kind of Federal aid. Time and space permit only a hurried, cursory and therefore inadequate mention of main features of these proposals. One proposal is that the locality issue revenue bonds guaranteed by the Federal Government. Another is that the locality issue revenue bonds and the Federal Government exempt from taxation private income invested in those revenue bonds. Another, that the locality issue revenue bonds with Federal guarantee and that the shortage of the proceeds or revenues from the area to service fully the obligations incurred for the cost be covered by 50–50 state and Federal grants-in-aid; which is in effect back to Federal advances repayable from the proceeds or revenues from the land purchased with them excepting only that the State bears one-half of the uncovered deficiency. Obviously each of these modes, and the many variations of them the imagination can easily conjure, will bail out the owners as fully as the more simple mode of Federal advances for land acquisition costs to be repayable out of the proceeds or revenues from the land so far as these will reach. None of said three proposals has as yet been incorporated into any bill. The New York statute uses partial tax exemption of the land and buildings as the mode of tempting the developer to take over the area at cost.(3) Other statutes copy the New York measure, with the not unimportant exception that they leave out the tax exemption and substitute nothing in its place; thus guaranteeing

(1) In effect this is the method on which the Maryland statute relies.

(2) The Kentucky statute authorizes acceptance of Federal and state aid and even local taxation for covering the land acquisition cost, but without any detailed procedural steps; likewise the Wisconsin and Maryland statutes. The Kentucky statute does not base selling or leasing prices on use value but on a scale of percentage reductions specified in the statute.

(3) Also the Michigan and Wisconsin statutes.

either no redevelopment or undesirable exploitation of a few areas to the long-term detriment of the community as a whole. The Maryland statute does specify planned use value as the correct basis for the sale or lease of the redevelopment area and thereafter for taxation. But the Federal or state aid which are recognized as necessary and which has been embodied in the Thomas and District of Columbia bills has not yet reached statutory status.

Finally, just a few words on a question about which the hearers or readers of this scrambling essay will expect a lawyer to say something, namely the constitutional question. Is it constitutional to use the power of eminent domain and spend public money for assembling land, stamping land-use plans thereon and disposing of the land subject to such plans? Why not? Nothing is unconstitutional, as Mr. Chief Justice Hughes said, until the courts make it so; and why should we predict that the courts will say that a carefully drawn measure, rational in its conceptions, genuine in its details, administered with intelligence and integrity, and which meets a real social and economic evil which, by its very nature, cannot be reached without public action of this nature, why, if these ifs be fulfilled, should anyone venture to predict that the courts will make such a statute unconstitutional? These IFS are the important constitutional factor. There is much material in the decisions on low-rent housing which promises favorable decisions upon the validity of this new type of legislation.

There are now two decisions on urban redevelopment legislation itself. One of these is the New York decision on Stuyvesant Town; but that decision was based entirely upon an express provision in the Constitution of New York which authorized eminent domain and tax exemption for the removal of bad housing conditions regardless of the uses to which the redeveloped area is to be put. The wisdom of such a constitutional provision is debatable; but we should all be aware that the New York decision is based upon an express provision of the New York state constitution and therefore not applicable in other States. The other decision was by an Illinois court of first instance passing upon a proposed area redevelopment in Chicago under the Illinois statute. That decision was unfavorable, and the case is now pending in the appellate court. That decision should not, however, be allowed to act as a deterrent; particularly as it is based on some provisions of the Illinois statute which are open to challenge on principle. So even if the decision come to be sustained by the upper court, that should not be allowed to throw cold water on going ahead with improved legislation, planning and administration. To all who are eager for something which carries promise to the welfare of the people and who understand constitutional law, an adverse decision is simply a stimulus to going ahead with better work.

Statutes, Bills and Decisions mentioned in above paper:

Statutes:

Arkansas:
Illinois: Vol. 1 Laws of 1941, p. 431—entitled "The Neighborhood Redevelopment Corporation Law."
Indiana: Ch. 307 Laws of 1943.
Kansas: Ch. 118 Laws of 1943 (applies to cities of 110,000 or over).
Kentucky: K.R.S. 99.010 to 99.210; some amendments made in 1944; applies only to Louisville.
Maryland: Ch. 664 Laws of 1943—applies only to Baltimore.
Michigan: Public Acts of 1941 No. 250—applies only to Detroit.
Missouri: Laws of 1943 (H.B. 239) p. 751—applies only to St. Louis.
New York: There are two statutes, the earlier one on redevelopment corporations;
the later one on redevelopment companies, Ch. 845 of the Laws of 1942 amended in Ch. 234 of the Laws of 1943.
Wisconsin: Ch. 333—Laws of 1943, Wisconsin Statutes 66.405.

Pending Bills:

Thomas Bill—(S.-953).
Capper-Randolph Bill—(S-1930, H.R.-4847).
Tydings-Randolph District of Columbia Bill (S-1923, H.R.-4819).

Judicial Decisions:

Matter of Murray et al v. La Guardia as Mayor. 291 N. Y. 320; certiorari denied, 88 U. S. Supreme Court, L. Ed. Adv. Opinions, 461.

Zurn v. City of Chicago—Circuit Court of Cook County.

Postwar Municipal Finance in the National Econony

WALTER W. HELLER, Assistant to the Director of Tax Research, U. S. Treasury Department[1]

THE problem of postwar municipal finance might be discussed in any one of a number of settings. For example, it might be examined in relation to the general level of local services or of a specific service like schooling or fire protection. Or it could be discussed in terms of overall city planning and urban redevelopment. Or one might explore municipal finance in terms of its mainstay, the property tax.

But the American Planning and Civic Association—recognizing how tightly the local economy is interwoven with the national economy and how important it is to coördinate local, state, and Federal taxes and fiscal policies—has asked for a discussion of postwar municipal finance in the broad setting of the national economy. And this, it seems clear, is a realistic setting. For the municipalities cannot "live alone and like it." They draw on the entire national economy for their support, and their responsibilities go far beyond their own borders. Healthy municipal finance demands a healthy national economy. Efficient municipal finance

[1]The views expressed herein are the author's own and not necessarily those of the Treasury Department.

demands coördination of local, state, and Federal fiscal systems. And, in turn, a sound national economy demands the harmonizing of municipal, state, and Federal finance.

The moment we probe into any one of the fields of taxation, public borrowing, and government expenditure, it becomes evident that the fiscal systems of our three levels of government lack harmony and are badly in need of coördination.

Conflicting Taxation

Probably the most obvious *un*coördination that exists is in the field of taxes. Here we find overlapping taxes, insufficient regard by one government for the taxes of others, and, especially at the local level, a poor correlation of tax resources with government responsibilities. We cannot, of course, retain our Federal system, based as it is on local self-government and a federation of forty-eight States, without paying some price in duplication and conflict. But the price we are now paying seems unduly high.

In the old days, when the States and localities drew their revenue from property taxes, while the Federal Government depended on liquor and tobacco taxes and customs duties, conflicting taxation was hardly a problem. But, as the sphere of government expanded, conflicts developed. With only a limited number of tax streams to fish in, the different governments soon found themselves fishing the same streams. And, in looking for elbow room on the banks of the stream, each government inevitably jostled the others.

By 1941, overlapping use of the same revenue sources characterized about 62 percent of all local, state, and Federal revenues. Almost three-quarters of all state tax collections and nine-tenths of all Federal tax collections in 1941 were derived from tax sources jointly employed by state and Federal governments. With respect to specific taxes, the Federal Government dominates (that is, collects more than half of total revenues from the given tax source) in net income, death, gift, liquor, tobacco, and payroll taxes. State governments dominate in business taxes and in motor-vehicle license and gasoline taxes. Local governments, of course, dominate in property taxes. Only customs duties and property taxes are completely free from state-Federal overlapping.

Overlapping taxes, together with diversities among state and local tax laws, multiply costs of collection as well as costs and irritations of compliance. For individuals, it is largely a matter of inconvenience or nuisance, as in filling out two sets of income-tax returns or going through two different property-tax assessments each year. This is bad enough. But for complex businesses, a welter of conflicting taxes is even worse. Merely in terms of keeping the necessary records and filling out diverse tax forms, businesses are subject to unnecessary and often heavy expense. Moreover, since tax laws differ from city to city and from State

to State, both individuals and businesses run the risk of double or multiple taxation.

Even if tax conflicts were confined entirely to the state and Federal levels, the cities could not view the situation with anything but alarm. The cities are subdivisions of the States and anything that adversely affects the States adversely affects local government. The effect may be direct, as in the case of state-local shared taxes; or it may be indirect in weakening the State's ability to serve local government.

Unbalance Between Revenues and Responsibilities

Lack of coördination is not, of course, simply a matter of conflicting taxes. It runs much deeper, as we found in the depression of the thirties.

That great depression highlighted a basic unbalance that had developed between the revenues available to local governments and the services they had to perform. Taxes fell off sharply in the early thirties, but costs of running local government were stubborn and refused to fall off correspondingly. In fact, new responsibilities for relief and public works were thrust on the cities. In the face of limited sources of revenue, they had to turn to borrowing. And in the face of debt limits or poor credit standings, they had to turn to state and Federal governments for aid.

Aside from its RFC and PWA loans, the Federal Government responded mainly by a great expansion of the grant-in-aid system. These aids seemed to promise the localities a means of carrying out the services demanded of them without being forced to resort to unsound tax devices and borrowing practices. At the same time, the grants-in-aid promised the Federal Government a means of putting a Nation-wide policy into effect without doubling up on state and local services. As yet, however, the aid device has not met these goals.

Most students of the subject feel that the grants-in-aid fell short of expectations because they did not have a fair trial. The critics point out (1) that so-called matching grants instead of variable, or equalization grants were used and (2) that only a few selected, often secondary, services were favored to the detriment of broader classes of services that needed support.

The matching principle requires the States and municipalities to match the Federal grants dollar for dollar—otherwise no grant is forthcoming. Since rich States *had* more dollars to match the grants than poor States, they were able to *get* more dollars of aid from the Federal Government. Furthermore, the poor States so extended themselves to match the Federal grants offered for selected services that they sometimes had to starve or undernourish other services.

Thomas H. Reed, in his study entitled *Federal–State–Local Fiscal Relations*, prepared for the Municipal Finance Officers Association and published in 1942, criticized Federal and state assistance on the ground

of its inequities and uncertainty, and because it stimulated local expenditure rather than relieved local tax burdens.

Federal grant-in-aid policy to date has not generally recognized economic differentials among States and regions. It has exerted equal pressure for expenditures on units with unequal resources. Despite the strong national interest in at least a minimum level of education, of public health, and of public welfare—merely the minimum consistent with the democratic principle of equal opportunity for all—no clear-cut policy of underwriting or guaranteeing a national minimum has yet been developed.

Perverse Cyclical Policy

Thus we find *un*coördination not only in taxation but also in the balance, or rather, unbalance between taxation and expenditure at at different levels of government. When we add borrowing to taxes and expenditures, we find a still further lack of coördination. We find what has been aptly termed "the fiscal perversity of municipal finance in boom and depression."

Or, to put it more simply, municipal finance in the past, instead of helping to even out the peaks and valleys of our business cycles, has helped build up the peaks and deepen the valleys. In the boom of the late twenties the municipalities indulged themselves in heavy borrowing, extensive public works, and tax reductions. In short, they magnified the boom. In the depression of the thirties, they did the opposite. Instead of joining the Federal Government in a bold attack on deflation, they retreated into their financial shells. They reduced their borrowing. They levied new taxes, especially taxes weighing on consumption. And they cut their expenditures on public works. In other words, while the Federal Government was fighting *deflation* with a public works program and deficit financing, state and municipal financial policies were inadvertently working in the opposite direction.

At present, during the war, the situation is reversed. While the Federal Government is locked in a death struggle with *inflation*, some state and local units have reduced taxes. By cutting property and income taxes, for example, they have put unexpected spending power into consumers' hands just when the national interest demands that consumer spending be cut to the bone. Fortunately, many States and municipalities are following the sound wartime policy of cutting their debt instead of their taxes, and putting their financial houses in order for the postwar period. But when we find that only eleven of our forty-eight States have specifically authorized their subdivisions to build up reserve funds, we realize what enormous gaps exist in fiscal planning.

Even this very cursory survey of (1) intergovernmental tax conflicts, (2) the bad alignment of municipal revenues with municipal responsibilities, and (3) the "perversity" of local finance, reveals an urgent need for improved fiscal planning at the municipal level. And this discussion

in no way presumes to be exhaustive. Such grave problems as those of blighted areas and migration to the city fringes are not within the bounds of this paper; that they are nonetheless of vital importance is illustrated by the fact that here in the City of Saint Louis alone, blighted areas annually cost $5.5 million more to run than they contribute in taxes.

True, the war, by inflating tax yields and postponing many expenditures, has glossed over some of the worst defects of local finance. But, in the absence of realistic planning, both the chronic and the cyclical weaknesses of local finance are bound to reappear after the war. Only if the cities work in advance on their postwar finance problems can they hope to meet the joint demands of sound city government and a stable postwar economy.

Remedies

What can the municipalities as a group do to serve the dual purpose of strengthening their own finances and bolstering the postwar economy? Several possible lines of action suggest themselves:

1. Active participation in the movement to set up a joint Federal–state–local fiscal agency.
2. Coöperation with state and Federal governments in working out a more rational and flexible grant-in-aid policy.
3. Reploughing the field of local revenue, especially the property tax field.
4. Reorientation of local finance to recognize and combat depression and boom by such devices as postwar and prosperity reserves, public works programming, etc.

A Federal–State–Local Fiscal Agency

The problem of conflicting taxation has long since given birth to proposals for establishing a national tax commission or some similar agency. A number of bills have been introduced in Congress in the past few years to set up such a body.

Two recent proposals which are attracting widespread interest are those made by the Committee on Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations (composed of Professor Harold M. Groves of the University of Wisconsin, Dr. Luther Gulick of the Institute of Public Administration, and Miss Mabel Newcomer of Vassar College) and by Messrs. Hansen and Perloff of the Federal Reserve System in their recent book, *State and Local Finance in the National Economy.*

The Groves–Gulick–Newcomer committee was appointed by Secretary Morgenthau in 1941 to study and report on the problem of fiscal relations. It submitted its findings to the Treasury early in 1943. In its report (*Federal–State–Local Government Fiscal Relations*, Senate Document No. 69, 78th Cong., 1st sess.) it recommends that machinery to achieve coördination be set up in the form of a Federal–State Fiscal

Authority. The FSFA (for which, incidentally, our Washington alphabet still has room) would consist of three full-time members, one to be appointed by the President, one by the States, and the third (presumably an expert in municipal affairs) to be named by the first two. The Authority would be assisted by an advisory council representing a wide range of interests. Hansen and Perloff suggest an alternative agency, the Intergovernmental Fiscal Authority, to consist of seven members appointed by the President with the advice of state and local officials.

Either of the proposed joint agencies would be assigned such functions as conducting research and making recommendations on fiscal coördination; promoting better government reporting; acting as a "board of appeals" on such matters as Federal payments in lieu of taxes; promoting joint administration of taxes; and supervising the Public Work Reserve.

A coöperative agency could do yeoman service in promoting a coöperative attitude; getting the various governments around the conference table to eliminate conflicts; and stimulating a coördinated national fiscal policy embracing all three levels of government. It could serve as the watchdog of the coördination movement, protecting the interests of taxpayers and government alike.

Improvement of the Grant-in-aid Device

One of the major services that a Federal–state–local fiscal agency could perform would be to work out plans for a national *system* of grants-in-aid. As noted earlier, our present aid set-up really cannot be called a system. It is actually a series of uncoördinated individual grants. In the interests of certainty and balance in their finances, the municipalities should join hands to work for coördination and rationalization of these grants.

The grant-in-aid is not a cure-all. But it can serve as a valuable lubricant for a Federal system. It can in part bridge the gap between the financial resources of local units and the functions they are called upon to perform. It is a device whereby the national taxing power can be brought to serve cities and localities.

How can grants-in-aid be made more useful? Students of the problem have suggested three major steps:

(1) Concentrating aids on several broad services like education and health, in which there is a compelling national interest, instead of splintering them among a number of minor functions. The need for this step is dramatically illustrated by the fact that in 1941 Federal grants to States for grade crossings were greater than its total grants in the field of public health.

(2) Recognition of the need for a national minimum of services, that is, provision not only of straight matching grants but also of differential or equalizing grants favoring the poorer States and cities. In some areas, needs for services far outstrip taxable capacity. For example, the Ad-

visory Committee on Education estimates that in 1935 New York had 9 percent of the total educational *need* of the country and 21 percent of total financial *ability*. On the other hand, the fourteen Southern States, together, had 34 percent of educational *need* but only 16 percent of financial *ability*. It is on discrepancies like these that the case for variable grants-in-aid rests.

(3) Provision for review of grants-in-aid by an intergovernmental agency to which States and localities could bring appeals in cases where the national policy worked an injustice on the particular unit.

Given these changes in Federal-aid practices, the States and cities could count, throughout, on a minimum standard of certain essential services like schooling and health, without starving other essential services. And the Federal Government would have a logical mechanism to carry out a Nation-wide policy.

The criticism will be made that this is an insidious way for the Federal Government to gobble up state and local powers. In the absence of adequate safeguards, this criticism would have some substance. The power of the purse is very compelling. But safeguards can surely be provided in the grant-in-aid laws, laws which are passed by members of Congress representing not only national interests but also state and local interests.

Moreover, compared with alternatives, expanded grants-in-aid may well be the lesser of evils. Without them, the cities would be faced with the choice of (1) adopting taxes basically unfit for local use, like the income tax or sales tax; or (2) leaving important services without adequate support; or (3) forcing the Federal Government to take over functions which can really be administered more effectively by local officials. Seen in this light, Federal aids properly safeguarded, are actually a device to strengthen and preserve, rather than undermine, local government.

In discussing development of Federal aids, one cannot ignore the ominous movement now under way to amend the Federal Constitution to limit Federal taxes on incomes and estates to a top rate of 25 percent. Some fifteen States have already called upon Congress to approve this so-called "twenty-second amendment." If Federal income and estate taxes were cut back to a top rate of 25 percent, state and local governments would be the losers. In the face of a 25-percent maximum rate, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to sustain the aids currently provided for highways, for the aged and physically handicapped, and for agriculture. Moreover, the possibility of extending Federal assistance in such fields as education and public health would almost certainly be destroyed. The whole concept of establishing a national minimum of certain basic services would go out of the window.

The move to put the 25-percent limit across is steadily gaining ground. Municipalities have a vital interest in this amendment, for it would in-

directly result in weakening their power to give the people many important services and would make local finance harder to manage. Purely as a matter of self-interest, and apart from the folly of writing tax laws into the Constitution, the municipalities should vigorously oppose the 25-percent limitation proposal.

Development of Local Revenue Sources

The foregoing discussion of grants-in-aid is not intended to point the way to the financial salvation of city government. True enough, inequalities of resources and services will always require a Federal hand; weakness of one part of the Federal body affects all other parts. But this does not mean that the cities should lean on Federal aids to bail them out of trouble after the war. If they regard such aids as their financial salvation rather than as a supplement designed to guarantee certain services, they will endanger both the vitality and the independence of local governments.

The Groves–Gulick–Newcomer committee, especially, decries the picture of local units running hat in hand to the central units. The committee points out that it makes little sense for cities to ask the Federal Government to solve their financial problems, since, in the last analysis, the source of the funds on which the Federal Government must draw is within the local units themselves. The committee snorts at what it calls "the spectacle of a city like New York, popularly regarded as the 'gold coast' of a rich country, going through one financial predicament after another, obliged to adopt a sales tax which its mayor had successfully attacked in Congress, and frankly conceding its future dependence on Federal revenues. . . ." In other words, a balance must be struck between the assistance derived from the Federal Government and the more intensive development of independent sources of local revenue.

What direction should such development take? It might, on one hand, take the direction of diversification and greater reliance on taxes other than the general property tax. As a matter of fact, there has been a considerable trend in this direction over the years. The average city now pays only about two-thirds of its bills with money from property taxes. The amount contributed by other taxes has grown during the war. On one hand, locally shared state taxes have contributed larger amounts as state tax yields have risen. On the other, many cities have turned to such measures as admissions taxes, increased license fees, levies on beverage sales, and excise taxes on utility revenues. But since the use of these taxes often involves piling taxes three deep and further complicates a revenue system that is already highly complicated; and since, in addition, local units suffer too much leakage in applying taxes to bases other than property, it appears that the local revenue potential of such taxes is strictly limited.

This consideration leads us to reconsider the backbone of local

finance, namely, the property tax. A proposal that has aroused great interest in recent months, largely through the impetus given it by the Groves-Gulick-Newcomer committee, would recast the present property tax into a service charge on landlords and an occupancy tax on tenants and owner-occupiers. The service charge on landlords would resemble the present property tax. The occupancy tax, though long used in Great Britain, would be something new under the American fiscal sun. It would be more personal than the general property tax, being based on annual rental value rather than sales value.

The major advantage of the occupancy tax based on rental value is that it achieves better correlation of taxes with income and with current ability to pay. Its chief drawbacks are that it would require a second valuation of each property in use and that its weight would fall primarily on housing, a field in which national policy calls for an improvement of standards.

Nonetheless, the occupancy tax remains an interesting possibility. It would give the municipalities a foothold in a new revenue field without running hat in hand to central governments. It might prove to be just what is needed to prime the property-tax pump.

Municipal Finance in the Fight Against Depression and Boom

The point was made earlier in this paper that state and local governments have shown a peculiar perversity in their fiscal policies. Instead of manipulating their tax, borrowing, and expenditure policies to work against the ebbs and flows of our economic system, they have gone along with the tide and have, in fact, contributed to those tides. In prosperity, their credit has been good, their tax yields have been high, and they have succumbed to the generally expansive feeling which leads to heavy construction programs, large-scale borrowing, and tax reductions. In depression, on the other hand, they ran up against debt limits, property-tax delinquencies, and a weakened credit standing; as a result, instead of bucking the tide of economic contraction, they quite naturally ran with it.

The lesson to be drawn from this experience is not, of course, that local and state governments bear responsibility for cyclical forces that are nationwide in scope and origin. Rather, it is that the cities and States have a vital stake in high levels of economic activity and employment and can aid materially in attaining those levels. The thing that makes the local tax base productive is prosperity. Anything the local units can do to coöperate with, rather than frustrate, a national policy aimed at a stable and prosperous economy is all to their own good. Acting alone, any given city or State can do little. But acting in concert, the cities as well as the States have the fiscal power to make a telling contribution to postwar prosperity.

What can they do? Although the problem of welding local, state, and

Federal fiscal policies into a national fiscal policy is no simple matter, a few devices to get closer to that goal readily suggest themselves.

One of them is a system of building up reserves during prosperity for a rainy day to come. The principle of building up wartime reserves for the postwar period is now very widely accepted as sound state and local finance. This principle can be applied just as well to a peacetime prosperity situation. Wartime reserves serve the dual purpose of neutralizing inflationary spending power during the war boom and providing a bulwark against the postwar slump. Peacetime reserves could be devoted to strictly parallel ends.

The policy of maintaining high tax rates during a boom and cutting tax rates in a slump is good national economic policy, good local finance, and even better personal finance. The easiest time to pay taxes is during a boom. And the best time to spend money is during a slump. Off-peak expenditures on such things as public works not only act as a shot in the arm for an ailing economic system, but generally offer the municipality a chance to get needed work done at costs well below those encountered at the peak of prosperity.

The use of a capital budget also suggests itself as an instrument of sound fiscal planning. Municipalities would know much better where they stand and would have a much better basis for fiscal planning if they divided their budgets into (1) a current or operating budget and (2) a capital budget. Current costs would be loaded into the current budget and capital outlays would be loaded into the capital budget. This would facilitate staying on a pay-as-you-go basis for current expenses as well as proper writing off of capital investments in the period of their useful life.

If they are to follow a successful countercycle policy, the municipalities must also find some way of maintaining their credit standing during depression periods. This again probably calls for intergovernmental coöperation. Hansen and Perloff have suggested the establishment of an Intergovernmental Loan Corporation to provide adequate credit to state and local governments. The Corporation would be authorized to buy state and local securities with Federal monies. It would help to free local governments from pressures to retrench unduly in depression periods. Too often in the past, they have had to reduce services and increase taxes as a prerequisite to obtaining funds from private sources during a depression. The Loan Corporation, operating on the revolving-fund plan, would relieve them of this pressure by providing a back-stop whenever needed.

Imposing legal and economic barriers, as well as traditional practice, stand in the way of countercycle finance at the local level. But the potential rewards, both to local government and to the Nation, of a strong countercycle fiscal policy are so great that the municipalities should bend every effort to break through these barriers.

Conclusion

Postwar planners in the municipal field dare not ignore the cost of fiscal discord between local, state and Federal governments. Their fiscal planning has to proceed in full view of the interdependence of the local and national economies.

Encouraging evidence that municipal officials are aware of the need for harmony is provided in the widespread interest and activity which they have shown in the coördination movement. The Municipal Finance Officers Association, for example, is reexamining local revenues against the background of state-local and Federal-local relations. In 1942, its Committee on Local Government Revenues and Activities, headed by Dr. Thomas H. Reed, submitted a searching report on local-state-Federal fiscal relations. Specific points of fiscal contact between Federal and local governments are being examined by its Committee on Federal Fiscal Relations. Another of its committees is examining the fundamental question: "From what sources can local governments best obtain their revenues?"

Brought into focus by planning for the postwar period, the move to strengthen municipal finance by coördinating it with state and Federal finance has gained great momentum. Through efforts of bodies like the Municipal Finance Officers Association and the American Planning and Civic Association, the coördination movement has a better chance than ever before of moving out of the sphere of *talk* and into the realm of *action.*

Housing: What Private Enterprise Can Do

THOMAS S. HOLDEN, President, F. W. Dodge Corporation,
New York City

IT SEEMS to me that few people have fully appreciated the true nature of the real estate revolution that has taken place in the United States since the end of World War I, or the extent to which that revolution affected the depth and duration of the depression of the 1930's.

The nationwide urban real estate boom of the late 1920's represented the culmination of a trend that had been in progress since the earliest beginnings of the Nation. That trend was the enhancement of urban land values based upon rapid population growth. The decade 1920–1929 had the largest numerical increase in population in the country's history, and also the largest increase in urban population.

I scarcely need to remind you of the two great factors that arrested this historic trend. First, was the change in the overall rate of population growth of the country. Second, was the revolution in mass transportation brought about by vast expansion in ownership and use of automobiles. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that popularization of the automobile affected in one way or another the value of every parcel of real property in the United States. Such revolutionary changes necessitated widespread adjustments, not only in valuations of particular properties, but in basic appraisal concepts and in mortgage-lending practices. Much of the necessary adjustment has been made, but it is still far from complete; we still have quite a way to go to adjust real estate taxes.

Nationwide use of the mortgage providing for periodic amortization, together with the drastic deflation of values that took place in the 1930's, has, almost for the first time, made property-owners generally conscious of depreciation. Owners of rental property are permitted to deduct depreciation allowances in figuring net income subject to taxation. All owners are thoroughly familiar with the commercial depreciation of the automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines and radios which they buy on installment credit in very much the same way that most of them acquire houses. In many local communities property owners have had to use depreciation of values as arguments for realistic assessments from taxing authorities anxious to maintain total assessed valuations at the highest possible figure. The real estate market is realistic about values. Sales of urban properties have become more active in recent months, in many cases being made at prices below the artificial valuations still standing on the assessment rolls. Property sales in Manhattan during March were made at prices averaging a third under assessed valuations.

The impact of the war has brought on another series of adjustments,

showing quite conclusively that the real estate conditions of the 1930's have not remained frozen. The war has, as always, caused a rise in the general price level, which would undoubtedly have gone much higher than it actually has up to the present time if price controls had not been put into effect. In March of this year, wholesale prices of all commodities were 35 percent higher than the average for the year 1939, according to the index numbers of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Wholesale prices of building materials were 26 percent over the 1939 average, small-house building costs were up 30 percent, and house-rents were 3½ percent up. Comparison of these figures indicates the greater effectiveness of wartime rent-controls compared with commodity-price controls.

To my mind, there is little doubt that commodity prices and rents will advance still further after ceilings have been lifted. They always have after every war, because there is always in the early postwar period a great excess of purchasing power over available goods and over available housing accommodations. It is generally recognized that the greatest inflation threat comes in the postwar period and it is the earnest hope of many people that this time a tapering off of price controls rather than their sudden removal may enable us to escape this postwar danger. If the threat of postwar price-inflation is successfully met this time, it will be the first time in our history.

I strongly believe, with the backing of a number of able economists, that whenever controls are lifted, there will be a tendency to rising prices; it is hoped that the rise will be orderly and not chaotic. One economist has estimated that by the end of two years after the cessation of hostilities in Europe, the index of wholesale prices of all commodities, which now stands at 35 percent over the 1939 level, will be 70 percent above 1939.

This estimate of the general postwar commodity price-level does not tell us what the relative figures on construction costs and rents will be. After the price inflation that followed World War I, there was a drastic deflation and an orderly reflation of prices; a comparatively stable level was reached which persisted for about six years, with wholesale commodity prices ranging 40 to 50 percent above prewar levels. During that time, building material prices were about 80 percent above the prewar level, construction costs about 117 percent above prewar, and house rents about 65 percent above prewar. I do not think this proves that construction costs and rents will, in the coming postwar era, be higher, relative to prewar, than general commodity prices will be. I am inclined to believe that the postwar residential building market will be much more sensitive to price changes than was the case in the 1920's, and I believe that maintenance of a sound relationship between rents, construction costs and general commodity prices will be a critical factor in maintaining residential building volume at the expected high levels. It is important, however, to take into consideration at this time the prospect of fairly far-reaching price adjustments.

Rising rent-levels will ultimately affect land values. Naturally, land values are affected on a selective basis, the more desirable plottage tending to rise, and the less desirable tending to remain at present levels or even to go down. If, as I believe, the earlier postwar residential building will take place in outlying and suburban areas rather than in the central urban districts, there is likely to be a narrowing of the present spread between urban and suburban land values, thus lessening to a degree the present competitive advantage of outlying plottage. It is interesting to note, in this connection, that this year's assessments for New York City show moderate reductions in total assessments in the older and more closely built-up boroughs of Manhattan, Brooklyn and the Bronx, with a slight increase for Queens, the borough of most recent growths and with the largest amount of vacant land.

Under any circumstances, it will be necessary for a postwar relationship between construction costs and rents to be established before any large amount of investment building, either commercial or residential, will be undertaken. The present relationship does not offer promise of an adequate income return to investors in new rental properties. As a matter of fact, the rent-construction cost relationship in the 1930's was not generally favorable to large-scale investment in housing properties, and this was a primary reason why the prewar volume of privately-financed rental housing was so small. The price-adjustment necessitated by war and postwar conditions tends to accelerate the general adjustment of values that was progressing, however slowly, in the 1930's. It tends to recreate conditions highly favorable to large-scale revival of private residential building.

Naturally, economic adjustments do not of themselves produce a building revival, which depends principally upon the existence of a demand, and evidences of a demand for residential building are very strong.

In the first place, the low rate of house-production during the poverty decade of the 1930's did not keep up with the country's needs. For every 16 new non-farm families, only 10 new dwelling units were built in the decade. Even with some allowance for a surplus in 1930, these figures create a strong presumption of a shortage at the end of 1939. The defense boom of 1940 and 1941 was accompanied by marked increases in private residential building, which was fast developing into a boom that had to be cut short by priorities and restrictions. The war housing program included only houses and other dwelling units of low valuation, drastically eliminating the strong demand that was developing for units to cost, with land, over $6,000. Numerous surveys have indicated immediate postwar housing demands running into millions of units. While such survey results must usually be heavily discounted as measures of actual market demand, they must be admitted as indicators of the existance of a large need and of definite intentions to build or acquire new houses by many thousands of people.

Numerous estimates of postwar residential building volume have been made. The lowest one I have seen is the one recently put out by the National Association of Real Estate Boards, indicating an average of 300,000 urban dwelling units annually for the first ten postwar years. This can probably be translated in 400,000 to 500,000 non-farm units annually. It seems to me that estimate fails to take into full account the very real prospects of postwar prosperity that we can definitely see. The highest estimate I have seen is 2,000,000 new family units a year, one which to my mind is manifestly absurd. It would call for the complete rehousing of America in less than 20 years, implying a rate of replacement far beyond that which any economic system could stand.

My own estimate is 820,000 new non-farm dwelling units a year for the first 10 postwar years. This is three times the average annual volume of the 1930 decade and a 16 percent increase over the average of the prosperous postwar decade of the 1920's. It presupposes a very high level of prosperity and a rate of replacement far beyond any we have ever had in the past. Other important assumptions back of this estimate will be stated hereafter. I regard my estimate as optimistic, though it is more conservative than most of those which have been published.

It can be reasonably expected that about two-thirds of the postwar new housing units will consist of single-family houses. That happens to be the proportion of single-family houses to total dwelling units in 1940, according to the census. It is also the proportion shown in the Dodge statistical record during the residential building recovery years 1937 through 1940.

Houses built for owners' occupancy should increase greatly, both houses built on owners' order and houses built by operative builders for sale. Prosperity tends to increase home-ownership. In the prosperous postwar decade of the 1920's the net increase in owner-occupied units, as shown by the censuses of 1920 and 1930, was 3,135,114 compared with an increase of 2,376,219 in tenant-occupied units, a ratio of 1.32 to 1. In the poverty decade of the 1930's, owner-occupied units increased by 1,193,689, compared with a 4,338,952 increase in tenant-occupancy, a ratio somewhat less than .28 to 1. Naturally, the great increase in tenant-occupancy in the 1930's was largely occasioned by inability of former owner-occupants to hold on to their property, as evidenced by the wholesale foreclosures of the period. The contrast between the two periods illustrates very strikingly the effects of prosperity and depression on home-ownership.

In view of widespread purchasing power available for down-payments, of ample mortgage money, and of probable continuation of the trend of population to outlying districts and suburbs, and also in view of investment uncertainties in the early transition period, residential building revival will most likely start with single-family houses for owners' occupancy. In the early postwar period, demand is apt to be relatively

strongest for houses to cost, with land, $6,000 and up; the more immediate demand for lower-priced houses has been very largely taken care of by the war housing program.

Demand for rental housing is apt to follow demand for houses built to owners' order and houses built by operative builders for sale. It will follow after the lifting of rent ceilings and after construction cost trends are sufficiently clear to indicate an adequate return. Two-family and three-family houses, types of dwindling importance, are apt to be relatively few; suburban apartments of the two-story walk-up type, running four or more suites to the building, are apt to be numerous. Large elevator apartments in central locations are likely to be in demand when and if our cities will be able to make major improvements as to street layouts, open-space developments, and improved traffic conditions. Large-scale urban developments may be aided by special legislation providing powers of eminent domain for land-assembly and tax-limitation inducements to offset the competition of cheaper sites in outlying areas.

Development of a large volume of rental housing may require some new form of equity financing. It would appear that a requirement for amortizing mortgages out of earnings tends to preclude the speculative financing that was prevalent in the 1920's. The fact that continuous debt-reduction continually enhances the equity position could be the basis of issuance of a sound type of equity stock not hitherto used in real estate financing. It has been urged by some people that we should have a method of financing mixed developments of houses for sale and houses for rent; something like Title VI of the National Housing Act adapted for peacetime use.

An important overall factor in determining the postwar volume of investment housing will be the tax situation, involving the tax policies and practices of government at all levels. It will also be necessary, in order to realize the potential residential building volumes indicated in my estimate, that there be continuous progress in reducing building costs, an end rather more likely to be achieved through numerous small economies than by any spectacular or radical new developments.

The analysis of residential building potentials that I have sketched for you is based upon my appraisal of economic conditions likely to prevail in the postwar period. My big overall assumption is that the United States will have a private-enterprise economy and not a government-dole economy. There seems to be a fairly considerable foundation for that assumption. The President has said that postwar housing activity "is primarily a job for private enterprise." The Baruch–Hancock report on War and Postwar Adjustment Policies says this: "The problem of demobilization, though difficult, is soluble if we create the atmosphere in which private enterprise and resourcefulness—the traditional American spirit—can again take hold." Senator George's Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, in its

report to Congress, has said: "The paramount consideration in the handling of all demobilization problems should be the preservation and strengthening of the American system of free competitive enterprise." Enough Senators and Congressmen have separately expressed views similar to these to indicate that the prevailing sentiment in Congress is for a private-enterprise system in the postwar period.

Private enterprise can produce all the housing facilities for which there is an economic demand. In order that the economic demand may approximate the housing needs of the country, we must realize all the potential prosperity we possibly can. To do so, we will have to remove the shackles that have been placed on the enterprise system in recent years.

Private enterprise cannot function satisfactorily under a tax system which penalizes thrift and risk-taking. It cannot function satisfactorily under a system of bureaucratic regulation of every undertaking. It cannot function satisfactorily under a system of government centralization which tends to eliminate the proper powers and functions of state and local governments. It cannot function under a system of government competition which perpetuates itself by unrealistic bookkeeping and unconventional cost-accounting. Under the most favorable circumstances, private enterprise cannot produce automobiles, groceries or houses to sell below cost. And above all, a private enterprise economy cannot produce Utopia overnight; it puts its faith in an evolutionary progress, producing a fairly continuous improvement in living standards, such improvement being enjoyed in the first instance by those of every income-status who are competent to take advantage of opportunities offered to achieve a better way of life through their own hard work and ingenuity. People seem to have forgotten that the ambitions and efforts of all the individuals and families in our society to better their lot in life constitute as essential a part of an enterprise system as do the willingness of investors to risk their capital and the ambitions of enterprisers to start new ventures and to expand existing businesses.

Since my estimates are based upon an appraisal of economic demand permitted to function to its fullest potentials within a liberated enterprise system, they assume that the anticipated residential building volumes will be substantially achieved as private enterprise projects. Public housing requiring subsidy is, *per se*, outside the range of economic demand. Since Congress has given no indication as to whether it will authorize any Federal subsidies for public housing in the postwar period, or how much public housing, if any, it will authorize, it is quite impossible to make any estimate of postwar public housing activity. If our prosperity potentials are realized in full measure, postwar public housing will probably have to be sold to Congress and to the public strictly on its merits as a program for social betterment, not as a make-work program or as a slum-clearance program.

All are agreed that public housing should be non-competitive with

private housing. I take this to mean that it should not compete either with new housing facilities that can be built or with existing housing of decent minimum standards. Opinions vary as to the extent to which existing public housing has actually competed with private housing. It is my strong conviction that one of the best ways to eliminate actual competition and eternal controversy on the subject and to fit public housing into the social and economic pattern of the community is to apply subsidies, if any, in the form of rent-allowances made directly to aided families to supplement the rents that they can themselves pay out of their own incomes.

I think it may be said that the house-building industry, to the extent that such an entity actually exists, is ready to go ahead on an active and progressive building program. In fact, the housing market has been so widely advertised as a postwar bonanza that competition through the length and breadth of the house-building field is apt to be very keen indeed. Builders, more conscious than ever before of the necessity to produce at low cost, are ready to start operations. If opportunities permit, large-scale developments will come in due course. Also in due course will come new building materials and equipment; not only are established manufacturers studying improvements in their products, but war-expanded producers of raw and synthetic materials and of fabricated products are making definite plans to compete in the house-building and house-equipping market. Pre-fabrication has had a work-out in the war-housing program. The postwar period will afford that opportunity for a demonstration as to whether house-building can in fact, as well as in theory, became a mass-production industry. Regardless of whether the house fully prefabricated in the factory is ultimately a success, the trend toward greater plant production of sub-assemblies is very likely to progress, possibly at an accelerated pace. There is reason to hope that progress will be made in modernizing building codes, in view of widespread knowledge of the restrictive provisions many of them contain. In the atmosphere of an expanding competitive market, many obstructive practices, adopted as defensive measures in depression days, will tend to disappear or to lose their effectiveness. In short, private enterprisers of many kinds and in large numbers, many of them with ample capital, see in the postwar residental building market an opportunity for business expansion and profits; this is the best possible indication that private enterprise will push ahead to the limit of opportunities in the housing field.

Two possible dangers I see ahead; the danger of runaway prices in the early transition period and the danger of a speculative boom thereafter. Because I believe the postwar housing market will be sensitive to abrupt rises in building costs, I think there will be a continuous obligation on the part of building-product producers and suppliers and building labor to exercise self-restraint to the end that overall costs will be kept in bounds. Controlling a residential building boom will depend on having continuous

surveys of local housing-market needs and upon the self-restraint that can be exercised by financing agencies.

I do not hold with the defeatist assumption, a hangover from the great depression, that a postwar depression is inevitable, though minor ups and downs are likely to occur. I do not see any likelihood for a very long time to come of a repetition of the real estate revolution of the 1920's or of major adjustments, such as were required in the 1930's, in all the fundamentals of real estate development and real estate financing. The major adjustments that have already been made have in large degree set the real-estate patterns of the long-term future. In a free economy, further adjustments that may be necessary can readily be made.

In conclusion, I would like to remind you that continuous construction demand arises from an expanding economy. Repairs, modernization and replacement needs are continually with us; they are important in the whole economy but they fall far short of employing the construction industry on a prosperity basis. Accumulated shortages, such as we have today, are important, are highly potent in starting a building revival, but general economic expansion is essential for its continuation.

After World War I, construction shortages were made up about the end of 1924. Since two years were lost as a result of postwar price inflation and postwar price deflation, the net recovery period was four years. Construction activity did not slacken after shortages were caught up, but increased. The reason was that the revival period set the stage for a great economic expansion. We got into trouble because we permitted speculation to go too far, because we made no effort to control the boom, and because we made grievous mistakes in overall national policy and in nationwide uneconomic practices.

It seems entirely possible that the coming postwar revival will again set the stage for a great economic expansion. As to what particular kind of industrial development may predominate in that expansion movement, I do not know. No one in the past saw in advance the full expansion potentialities of the railroad and the automobile. In periods of discouragement in the past, defeatist philosophers have always been ready to tell us that the economy had matured and that no new frontiers were left to conquer. The trouble is that economists and statisticians have not been able to enumerate and classify the potentialities of human intelligence, ingenuity, resourcefulness and courage or to blue-print the kind of expansion which as a whole partakes of the nature of organic growth far more than it does of the nature of an engineer's prospectus.

Housing: Public Responsibility

JOHN IHLDER, Executive Officer, National Capital Housing Authority, Washington, D. C.

RECOGNITION of public responsibility for proper housing is of long standing, and has gone through many phases. One of the earlier phases following the great fire of London and conflagrations in some of our youthful cities, was regulation designed to reduce the fire hazard. But more than a century ago we, like other civilized Nations, began to add other regulations designed to protect the health and welfare of occupants of urban dwellings, and of the community as a whole.

These extensions of the police power due to recognition of public responsibility, were, at first, very tentative, for the dead hand of the past constantly reaches into the living present. If I may mix my metaphors, a practice which the Irish have taught us is often effective, the dead hand is especially potent when it can use a pithy phrase that expresses past thought based upon past conditions. So our use of the police power to assure decent housing was handicapped by the phrase that "a man's house is his castle," reminiscent of the day when kings had arbitrary power, but used even in America to prevent protection of the public health against landlords who claimed the right to do as they would with their own though by so doing they menaced the whole community.

So, today, our present effort to assure proper housing is handicapped by assertions that it will interfere with "free enterprise," a phrase reminiscent of the day when the characteristic business in America was that of an individual or of two individuals in partnership risking their own capital. Since then business itself has changed its pattern, has become characteristically corporate and, using capital provided by stockholders, has become, in the public interest, more and more subject to governmental controls. But the phrase "free enterprise" still affects our thinking.

Gradually, however, facts force us to modify our thinking. It is characteristic of the American people that they can face facts and devise the means to deal with those facts. In every crisis of our history we have had the wisdom and the courage to change or to supplement old procedures when experience proved that those old procedures were not adequate to current needs. So we did at the time of the American Revolution. And that experience inspired a Civil War poet to write that

> New occasions teach new duties
> Time makes ancient good uncouth.

Because we have known this and have acted upon our knowledge, we have grown in wealth and power. Had we not done so, this city in which we are meeting would today be alien—for there were those along the eastern seaboard who greatly feared the extension of our territory, believing that it would upset the existing balance of power.

The basic reason for extension of governmental responsibility in the field of housing is the same as that which caused the first settlement of America, that which caused the winning of the West. Throughout its history the United States has been a land of opportunity. It is to keep it a land of opportunity that we must assure proper housing for all our people. Today's frontier does not lie to the West; it is not virgin land for homesteaders. It lies in the midst of old settled areas; it is land that, following old procedures, we have spoiled and must now reclaim.

On this, I believe, there is now no serious difference of expressed opinion; slum owners are in an untenable position and so remain silent. But as recently as ten years ago there was real difference of expressed opinion. While there was general admission that slums were social liabilities, the hard-headed among us maintained that it was impracticable to deal with them effectively—"the poor make the slums" and the poor we have always with us. Before 1861 Scripture was quoted to defend slavery. But within the past ten years we have had public housing. Public housing has proved that the slums can be reclaimed.

So today the only serious difference of opinion is as to method. That difference, however, is of first importance, for the method we adopt must be effective. Failure to win our new frontier would be the first serious setback in American history. If we suffer this set-back, historians in the future may write that in 1944, for the first time, Americans proved unable to adapt themselves to new conditions.

In this, as in our previous crises, human and economic considerations are interwoven. The first settlements along the Atlantic Coast were founded by families who sought both personal freedom and opportunity for economic advance. The families who crossed the Alleghenies after British prohibition had been removed, had the same dual purpose. Those who later went from Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, and began, here at Saint Louis, the long slow westward journey, had the same dual purpose. Many of these pioneers carried with them an obligation to the past, to those who financed them.

So today we have the often contrary pulls of past and future, of obligation to the past, of urge toward the future. Again our hopes are based upon the future, and again the immediate, activating motive is economic.

Ever since the 1840's we have realized that our slums are social liabilities, but during much of this past century those slums have been economically profitable to their owners. So we contented ourselves with regulatory legislation designed to make tolerable that which had become intolerable. Even in this we did not succeed. We did raise sanitary standards somewhat, we did assure that construction should be good enough to prevent, with some exceptions, the collapse of buildings.

But during all those hundred years and more, our slums expanded. Constant opposition by persons of influence prevented the setting of ade-

quate housing standards, or in the few cases where they were set, succeeded in whittling them down. Constant ingenuity succeeded in getting higher rents for smaller and more crowded dwellings. In New York the six-story tenement and then the rear tenement succeeded the one-family house; then the two and three-room apartment succeeded the five-room apartment. In New England the wooden three-decker developed, flourished, and decayed. In Philadelphia the three-story, band-box, back-to-back house filled the interiors of squares behind the solid rows of street houses. In Washington the notorious alley dwellings became the characteristic slums of the Nation's Capital and then spread their blight over whole areas.

Meantime another change in conditions was taking place. Our rate of population growth was decreasing. In recent years some of our cities have actually decreased in population.

This was a new condition almost revolutionary in its effects. Our national economy had been based upon expectation of constant and large increase of population. Many of our great fortunes, before and after that of George Washington, were due to land speculation. With decrease in the rate of population growth, land began to lose speculative value. To be sure there are flurries still, there are exceptional cities, but by and large the day has gone when one can build a fortune on vacant land. An era has ended.

The effect of this has been profound. Ten, twenty years ago it was almost sacrilegious to suggest that government should *buy* land; its function was to sell what land it had even if in the discredited form of tax titles. Today conservative realtors suggest that the government buy slum areas and *lease*, not sell them for private redevelopment. By this means the required private investment is reduced and government assumes the risk or certainty of loss.

This change of conservative attitude toward land—particularly slum land—has not extended to the still profitable suburban areas, has been coincident with the disappearance of profit. For more than a century reformers fought a losing battle because the slums were profitable to their owners. Today, except for temporary conditions due to the war, slums in many cities have ceased to be profitable to owners. One sequence of this disappearance of profit is a series of economic studies which show that slums are very unprofitable to their communities. They have been unprofitable to their communities for many years, but that fact did not register until they became unprofitable to their owners also. The conclusion is that now the community should take them over, as New York took over its ferries when they ceased to be profitable to their owners.

Here in Saint Louis, for example, I am told that a study of three widely separated blighted areas shows that their cost for city services is approximately two and a half times the amount of tax revenue derived

from those areas. On the basis of this study it is estimated that the net cost of all such areas in Saint Louis to other taxpayers is four million dollars a year. This is the subsidy Saint Louis is paying for the privilege of retaining and expanding its slums.

In other cities similar studies have shown similar conditions and have lead to a similar conclusion—the slums must go. The question is, how they are to go.

The purpose of housing, whether private or public, or private and public, is to assure an adequate supply of good dwellings, so distributed as to location, type (one-family, multi-family) size and cost or rent, that they will meet the needs of all elements of the population.

To achieve this purpose there must be an overall planning agency which will determine how different sections of the community are to be developed or redeveloped.

If government is to buy and then dispose of land in accordance with the city plan, there must be a governmental agency with adequate legal powers and adequately financed with public funds.

On these three propositions there is, at the moment, general agreement so far as opinion has been expressed. It is to be remembered, however, that slum owners have taken no part in recent discussions. They may be heard from later. The vocal proponents of private housing opposing public housing, have been representative of some construction interests, their suppliers, and their financial backers.

But, so far as opinion has recently been expressed, there seems to be general agreement that:

1. The slums must go.
2. There should be an effective planning agency to direct future urban development and redevelopment.
3. There should be a governmental agency to buy and dispose of blighted urban areas that have become economic liabilities.

But at that point differences of opinion appear, differences as to the degree of governmental participation, Federal, state and local. For even the private builders demand government assistance, legal and financial.

Even those who talk most about "free enterprise" not only admit, they advocate, that government should plan the city's development and redevelopment, they advocate the creation of a government agency to buy and clear and then sell the slum areas—a money-losing proposition. They accept, reluctantly, that if the governmental agency sells its cleared slum areas to a private developer, it may impose a series of controls far beyond the housing and zoning regulations that once caused free enterprise spokesmen to prophesy that the builders would quit if so interfered with.

They are ready now, as a condition of receiving land at bargain prices, at the expense of the taxpayer, to comply for a while, with ceilings

on rents and on profits. But they ask in compensation that government shall assure those profits. This is not the free enterprise that built America. One thing, moreover, they demand, there shall be no "competition" by public housing. The reason for this demand is not clear, for from the public-housing point of view there is no "competition." Public housing is restricted to housing those for whom private enterprise cannot afford to build well. In fact the competition private builders have to fear is with other commodities, not with public housing.

Irving W. Clark, Manager of the Better Homes Department, Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company, stated this clearly in his "Challenge to the Housing Industry;"[1]

> The ability of the housing industry to *compete successfully*—not within itself—no—but with the automobile—the fur coat—jewelry, delayed vacations, etc., for a fair share of the consumer dollar, is its greatest problem in meeting challenge number one (To bring American housing standards up to the balance of our living economy), and in its solution rests the industry's answer to challenge number two (To develop the complete housing activity on a basis that will enable it to take its rightful place in our national economy—assuming the responsibility for its portion of maximum employment in the postwar period).

Mr. Clark included public housing as a part of the housing industry which is challenged to raise American housing standards and to assume responsibility for its portion of maximum employment.

There are two approaches to this task of rebuilding our cities and assuring an adequate supply of proper dwellings for all their people.

The first is: The job must be done. Recognizing its magnitude and its vital importance in our social and economic life, realizing that old methods have proven inadequate, we are prepared to supplement old methods with new ones.

This is the American way. This, plus our great natural resources is the cause of our wealth and power.

The second approach is: The job should be done. But more important than the job is the method of doing it. So the job will be done only to the extent that the method is effective. We may try to improve the method, we may seek to stimulate it by various forms of government assistance, so sapping its vitality, but in form at least, the old method must continue to be the only method.

The struggle between these two approaches is as old as humanity. Our history, with the exception of the Civil War, and the history of Britain, have been histories of evolution, the adherents of the old, however reluctantly, accepting the new. So the new was grafted onto the old. The histories of some other Nations have not been as happy.

In housing, which involves city rebuilding because housing occupies the greatest part of our urban areas, we have reached a point in our history where again we must make a decision. Shall we continue to rely

[1]Address before the Washington Building Congress, May 8, 1944

exclusively upon an old method that experience has proven to be inadequate to the whole job, or shall we supplement the old method to the extent necessary to achieve our purpose of cities freed of all their slums, cities with adequate and proper housing for all their people?

Those who advocate supplementing the old method recognize the value of the old. They believe that there is no substitute for private enterprise in promoting progress. But they also believe that, like all human devices, private enterprise has its limitations. It is not a panacea for all human ills. At the level where, in order to preserve the profit essential to its existence, private enterprise produces slums, another method must be used. That other method is public housing.

Starting then with the axiom, recently accepted by such organizations as the National Association of Home Builders, that the slums must go, there follows the necessary supplement that proper housing must be provided for the displaced slum dwellers. Following this is the statement that dwellings hereafter erected must be (1st) located in accordance with a plan for the development or redevelopment of the city, (2d) built in accordance with standards for construction and equipment, type of dwelling (one-family, multi-family), lot occupancy, size and arrangement of rooms, that will give assurance against undue deterioration.

Following this are the statements that (1st) private builders shall be given first opportunity to provide housing, (2d) that to the extent government assistance is not necessary, *i.e.*, to the extent that the occupants of the dwelling can pay a builder's or an owner's profit, the private builders, or their assigns, shall build, own and manage, (3d) but when government assistance is necessary to supplement tenant incomes, then the dwellings shall be provided by a public housing agency at least until private builders and owners have demonstrated by performance, not promises, that they can and do provide equally good dwellings at rents as low or lower than the economic or cost rents for public housing.

The last two statements are based upon the assumption that there will be a land agency to acquire and dispose of urban land and that it will sell or lease land allocated for low-rent housing on identical terms to a private or a public housing agency. These terms would, of course, include continuing governmental control in order to assure that the housing would continue to serve the purpose for which the site was sold or leased.

So we end as we began, with recognition of public responsibility and with recognition of the fact that new conditions necessitate new methods, new procedures. The new procedure here outlined is to supplement private housing with public housing to the extent necessary to assure proper housing for all our people.

When private builders ask us to go farther than this, to give them a monopoly, they invite us into a land of surmise, a land of promises unsupported by performance. They admit that even if they were given

cleared slum sites for nothing, they could not rehouse the former slum dwellers without subsidy. So they ask subsidy. Their first proposal is that all who cannot pay profit-producing rents shall be put on the relief rolls of the public welfare agency. This would add greatly to the tax burden by increasing the number of families on relief and by increasing the allowance for each family to include the landlord's profit. It would necessitate an increase of the relief agency's staff, at the expense of the taxpayer. And experience has shown that it would perpetuate the slums by assuring the slum owner's income. Public housing assures the elimination of the slum.

The Federal Public Housing Authority in 1944

PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK, Commissioner, Washington, D. C.

THE calendar year 1944 for the Federal Public Housing Authority saw the bulk of publicly financed war housing completed and the Federal Public Housing Authority in the midst of the biggest and the most varied management job in history. The year brought also rapidly increasing attention to postwar housing problems, needs and programs. Procedures were under preparation and techniques were being developed, through experimentation, for the disposal of war housing when it is no longer needed. Local communities throughout the Nation began reviewing their postwar housing needs and preparing data and plans, both for a rivival of private construction when that is possible and for a continuation of public housing in the low-rent field where private capital cannot operate.

As of October 31, 1944, the public war housing program totaled 830,000 accommodations for war workers—shelter vital to war production goals but which, on account of the temporary nature of the need, involved risks too great for private capital to undertake. This consisted of 583,000 family dwellings, 166,000 dormitory units and 81,000 stop-gap units—trailers, portable shelters and parks for private trailers to fill emergency needs. Publicly financed war housing was less than half the total program of more than 1,850,000 accommodations, the larger part having been built by private capital.

The public war housing assignments were 95 percent completed as of October 31, 1944. In 1943 alone, the year of peak demand, 391,000 new accommodations were completed at the rate of 1,100 a day. The provision of the bulk of this public war housing has been the task of the Federal Public Housing Authority since its creation, in February, 1942, as one of the three constituent units of the National Housing Agency, which has responsibility for all war housing.

This production has been achieved in the face of mounting shortages of materials and manpower. Standard dwellings which will become a

part of the Nation's stock of permanent housing were built in the earlier stages. But as the shortages grew more acute, the FPHA had to turn more and more to temporary housing, suitable only for wartime use because of substitute materials and of substandard construction methods and room sizes. About half of all public war housing, more than 400,000 units, is of temporary construction, which has been used almost exclusively since the summer of 1942. This temporary housing has been produced at $2,716 a family unit; permanent housing has cost $4,445 a unit.

Further economies in materials and tax dollars have been accomplished by building demountable houses that can be moved to meet shifting requirements, by reusing many times over trailers and portable shelters for purely emergency needs and by dividing up older houses and other structures into additional dwelling units. During 1944 we developed techniques for cutting up conventionally built, vacant temporary structures into panels which are being shipped up to 1,100 miles, to localities for reassembly to meet newly developed housing needs.

The FPHA's management responsibilities in 1944 reached unprecedented magnitude and encompassed a wide variety of tasks, from supplying sites and utilities for migrant war workers' trailers to operating whole new towns running up to 40,000 in population. The magnitude is indicated in the monthly revenue, which has been running as high as $15,000,000. War housing tenants generally pay rents prevailing in the communities for similar accommodations, with the exception of military personnel for which separate rent schedules approved by the War and Navy Departments are established.

Public war housing is bearing its share of the local governmental costs. Local governments receive amounts approximating the taxes that would be collected if the property were not tax exempt, less deductions for normal community services which the government is having to provide.

We have decentralized operating responsibilities among eight regional offices and a general field office for non-regionalized functions. These, in turn, have delegated responsibilities whenever possible to local housing authorities, most of which were established under the peacetime, low-rent housing program. These local bodies have carried out approximately half of our construction and management job.

This war housing has been financed by public appropriations and loan funds totaling nearly $2,300,000,000, much of which will have to be written off as a cost of the war. More than half the funds have come from appropriations under the Lanham Act, in which Congress set forth most of the basic principles for construction, management and disposition.

When war production is curtailed and workers return to peacetime jobs, the FPHA will have the responsibility of liquidating this huge investment in war housing. Before the end of 1944 the FPHA had established a disposition branch and was formulating procedures and studying

methods of accomplishing this task in the best interest of the Government and in accordance with the mandate of Congress.

Liquidation of the stock of permanent housing is primarily a matter of orderly disposition to bring a fair return to the government and to avoid disruption of local housing markets. In 1944 the Defense Homes Corporation, operated within the FPHA, sold one of its large-scale developments for higher income war workers to an investment group and started selling homes to occupants in other projects suitable for individual ownership.

The vast stock of temporary housing, however, presents a special problem. Substitute materials and substandard construction methods render this housing unsuitable for permanent residential use, and Congress has specified that it shall be removed within two years after the emergency, except where it is needed longer for orderly demobilization. There is little prospect, however, that the government will realize a sufficient return from ordinary salvaging operations to pay for the costs of removing the housing and restoring the sites.

To explore the possibilities of eliminating additional disposition costs and of conserving in more usable form the materials from this temporary housing, we conducted a series of experiments in 1944. Temporary structures were demounted into panels, some of which were reassembled into utility buildings suitable for a variety of non-residential purposes and others packaged for convenient shipment. The experiments proved the feasibility of panelized demolition; their complete success awaits the development of markets for these materials when substantial quantities of the temporary housing become available for disposition. At the end of 1944, however, considerable interest had been shown in the experiments, not only from potential domestic purchasers but also from foreign governments needing easily assembled building materials for war and postwar needs abroad.

Reconversion to a peacetime economy also will bring the Nation face-to-face with postwar housing needs. The National Housing Agency late in 1944 estimated the Nation's new housing needs in the first postwar decade at 12,600,000 dwellings, a third of which should be available at rents of $30 or less. In another study the NHA analyzed costs and made suggestions for a concerted effort toward bringing them down to a level at which new housing could be made available to the masses of the American people.

From the local communities came not only a renewed interest in overall planning and housing policies but also plans for a resumption of the low-rent, slum clearance program established under the United States Housing Act of 1937 and administered by the United States Housing Authority before its transfer, along with other public housing functions, to the FPHA. The FPHA asked the local communities to get firm estimates of their needs in the non-competitive, low-rent field and to make

known, in applications for a postwar shelf of both urban and rural projects, their intentions to build when and if Congress authorizes and appropriates the necessary Federal funds. In projecting these estimates, communities were instructed to leave a margin of 15 to 20 percent between the highest income level that public housing would serve and the lowest income level that can be reached by new private housing.

Under the present program, well under way when all housing resources were diverted to filling war needs, 105,500 good homes were provided in 171 communities for low-income families formerly living in unsafe, insanitary slums. During the war 62,500 additional homes are being completed with low-rent funds for war workers and will become low-rent housing after the war need is served.

This is a program of Federal assistance, through capital loans and annual subsidies, to housing authorities established in local communities to build and operate projects for families otherwise unable to afford decent homes. Under the housing act, $800,000,000 in loan funds and up to $28,000,000 in annual subsidies were authorized.

The capital costs are financed by 60-year loans, 90 percent of which may come from the Federal Government. Local housing authorities have obtained, at an interest saving, substantially more than the 10 percent minimum of their capital financing from private sources, until now $151,000,000, or more than a third of their permanent obligations, is in private hands. The interest profit on FPHA-held loans has been sufficient to pay all Federal costs of administering the program.

The only costs of the program to the Federal Government are the subsidies paid to local authorities to bridge the gap between the rents low-income families can afford and the rates that would have to be charged to make the projects self-supporting. From the beginning of the program through June 30, 1944, the total subsidies paid amounted to $35,000,000. Federal commitments on present low-rent projects total about $13,000,000 annually, but unusual war conditions and operating economies reduced the payable subsidy in 1943 to $8,600,000, or $8.38 per unit per month. Most of the balance of the subsidy authorization of $28,000,000 annually is committed for war projects that will come under the low-rent program after the war and for the 25,000 units which are under loan contract, but on which construction was suspended until after the emergency.

Local contributions, which must equal at least 20 percent of the Federal subsidies, are universally provided by tax exemption. Most authorities make payments to local governments in lieu of taxes which, under a new policy established in 1944, may now be up to 10 percent of annual rental income.

The projects are planned communities, with open spaces for playgrounds and other recreational activities. The housing is of fire-resistant construction, designed to last at least 60 years with minimum upkeep.

The dwellings contain modern kitchens, living-rooms and, except for 500 rural units, private baths, and have one to four bedrooms. Adequate laundry facilities are provided. About half the projects were built on sites formerly occupied by slums. The overall development cost of the 105,500 projects under low-rent occupancy is $489,000,000, or about $4,630 a unit.

The housing is rented to low-income families formerly living in slums. Before the war, the average admittance income of the tenants was $832 a year, or about $16 a week. Most housing authorities have established graded rent schedules adjusting the rates according to family incomes, which are re-examined periodically. Prewar monthly rates, including utilities, averaged $17.98 per unit. War conditions have brought higher incomes and acute housing shortages in many communities have necessitated some relaxation of income eligibility limitations for war workers already living in projects. As a result, the average monthly rental revenue increased to $20.38 per unit in 1943 in permanently financed projects.

To comply with the equivalent elimination of the Act, local communities have demolished or rehabilitated 90,500 slum dwellings in connection with present low-rent projects. This requirement has been suspended during the war because of acute housing shortages.

The preparation of postwar plans contemplates a continuation of the broad principles which have become well established under the present program. But during 1944 the FPHA, in consultation with local authorities, was considering changes within this framework that would place even greater responsibilities in the local communities, provide full financing from private sources of the capital costs of public housing, reduce the span of loan amortization and subsidy payments to 45 years and develop a more workable formula for a concerted attack on the rural slum problem.

The year brought also a reiteration of the proper sphere of public housing in the forthcoming postwar era. As Commissioner of the FPHA, I have set forth the following three guiding principles underlying our thinking and policies: (1) No new public housing should be provided where it is possible to fill a need with decent existing housing; (2) No public housing should be provided that will compete with private capital in its appropriate sphere; (3) To induce private capital to provide standard housing for the lowest possible income market, a gap of some reasonable percentage, say 15 to 20 percent, should be left between the highest income to be served by public housing and the lowest income which can be reached by new private housing.

Planning and Parks in the Federal City

MAJOR GENERAL U. S. GRANT 3rd, Chairman, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Washington, D. C.

1. All good Americans are interested in Washington as their National Capital. However, for those who have an interest in our civic improvement and the proper development of our cities, it has a special and unique interest in being our only city which was planned before construction began and which has continued to have a plan, although from time to time the plan has been lost sight of for periods of years. To them it stands out as the living and constantly evolving expression of our civilization as recorded in architecture, in educational and inspirational possibilities, in a suitable reconciliation of utilities and economics with those amenities of life necessary for what we have recognized as an inalienable right of the citizen, namely, "the pursuit of happiness."

2. In approaching its task the National Capital Park and Planning Commission has been actuated by the sincere belief that a city is actually the people living within its limits and that the buildings and structures, water and sewer systems, the transportation and innumerable other adjuncts in masonry, concrete and steel are merely appurtenances to furnish to this population the means for trying to carry out their vocations advantageously and the amenities of life in their leisure time. The Commission therefore looks upon its work as largely utilitarian, the solution of economic and social problems; but at the same time it is constantly inspired by L'Enfant's resolution in making the original plan for the city to have "those things done which would reflect an immortal honor on the Nation and rapidly raise the seat (of government) to a splendid and inviting capital."

3. The present war, like those that have gone before, has brought to Washington many serious new problems. In this case these problems are very much intensified by proportionately larger and more intensive changes in the Government structure. An increase of 42 percent in the population of the metropolitan area in two years has manifestly resulted in a crowding and over-loading of facilities never experienced before.

4. The primary problem of housing in the Metropolitan area has been met by the construction of temporary office buildings and the rental of many privately owned buildings for Government use; and by the construction of 57,537 dwelling units by private enterprise and 8,493 by public agencies, in addition to 9,048 dormitory units.

5. Since these had to be located where they could, they necessarily have not been arranged to mitigate traffic problems or to facilitate the movement of employees from their homes to their offices and back. However, the traffic problems that would otherwise have been in-

tolerable have been sharply reduced by the shortage of gasoline, the share-the-car program and the consequent greater use of public transportation. With the return of a plentiful supply of gasoline and the general public's purchase of automobiles, quite intolerable traffic congestion is to be expected. With a view to anticipating these conditions, studies are being made of general traffic and the solutions to the problems connected therewith, including the study of off-street parking possibilities.

6. In addition it is proposed that all temporary buildings be demolished as soon as possible and that new Government buildings for the increased number of employees who will undoubtedly remain in Washington, although the present war number is expected to decrease materially, be constructed along East Capitol Street and north and south thereof, so as to reduce the present congestion of Government employment between the Capitol and the White House. Legislative authority has been given for the prompt demolition of temporary and demolishable dwellings built as war housing.

7. The total population that will remain may be expected, as in the past, to have a definite relation to the number of Government employees remaining. According to the best estimates of both there will be a need for additional dwellings in certain categories as well as for additional Government office space.

8. The need for additional dwellings will be particularly in the low rent class. The extent of the need for low rent housing in the District is shown by the 1940 census, from which it appears that 53.9 percent of all persons in the labor forces in 1939 received a wage or salary income of less than $1200. This salary range corresponds to an ability to pay rent of $25 a month or less. It appears from the same source that only 19.2 percent of the rented dwelling units in Washington were available for a gross rent under $30, while in Cincinnati the percentage was 64.7 percent, in New Orleans 79.3 percent, in Milwaukee 28.9 percent, in Baltimore 54 percent and in Cleveland 43.6 percent. A further indication of the disproportion existing in the District between rentals available and income is the fact that the median gross rent was $45.1 whereas the median income was in the $1,000 to $1,200 range.

9. The crowding resulting from war conditions, especially among Negroes in the lower income brackets, has accentuated and spread the over-crowded slum conditions existing before the war.

10. In 1928 the slums were largely limited to inhabited alleys. These were hidden communities in the midst of the city blocks, in some cases in the best neighborhoods, originally constructed as slave quarters for the slaves of the houses facing the street. With the emancipation of the slaves, this use of the alley houses was abandoned and they became separated from the houses on the streets and like the off-street buildings in foreign cities naturally became slums. At that time the clearance of

alleys was, therefore, the chief remedy required for the slum conditions, and the Commission was able, with the help of foresighted and sympathetic groups of citizens, to get through Congress the legislation setting up the Alley Dwelling Authority for acquisition and rebuilding of the alley slums. Very satisfactory progress was made for the first two years with the funds initially available, after which appropriations were stopped. Since then the Alley Dwelling Authority has been operating as the local housing authority under the U. S. Housing Act, but the clearance of alleys had to be abandoned because of the limitation of $1.50 per square foot for the land it could acquire under the new policy. However, it did succeed in building 2,432 dwelling units on such land as it could acquire within this limitation. Then came the war and it has had to devote itself largely to the construction of temporary war housing.

11. In anticipation of the serious slum problem existing today and the need for general slum clearance and redevelopment of blighted areas as soon as building construction can be resumed on a large scale, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission is recommending appropriate urban redevelopment legislation, which will open the door to private enterprise to do as much of the reconstruction work as possible and leave only that which cannot be done by private enterprise, without undue subsidy and expense, to be done by the very efficient National Capital Housing Authority.

12. Quite a squabble has been precipitated in connection with this legislation, because the local Home Builders Association and the Housing Committee of the Federation of Citizens Associations desire to make it the occasion to kill public housing and eliminate it entirely from the field. This would be only of local interest if it were not for the hope on their part that the action taken here may be a precedent for effectively fighting public housing everywhere else. Actually the Commission's bill would open the field, heretofore closed to private enterprise and facilitate its doing much more in low-cost housing than it has ever been able to do in the past, but keep the public housing agency on hand to fill the need where private enterprise cannot economically provide the very low-rent housing needed by the lowest income groups.

One of the chief responsibilities with which the Planning Commission was originally charged was "to preserve the flow of water in Rock Creek, to prevent pollution of Rock Creek and the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers, to preserve forests and natural scenery in and about Washington, and to provide for the comprehensive, systematic and continuous development of a park, parkway and playground system of the National Capital." The development of a complete program to fulfil this responsibility was, therefore, one of its first undertakings. Believing with Lloyd George that "one of the first conditions of national strength, national efficiency and national happiness, is in a scheme of town planning which will enable every child to have its fair share

of the good things God has intended for them," the Commission proposed a system of playgrounds and major recreational centers, on the basic principle that playgrounds should be so located as to require not a much longer walk than one-fourth mile to reach them and that the recreation centers should be approximately within a mile of those who would have to use them. These special areas for organized recreation were of course in addition to the larger but much more widely separated parks such as Rock Creek and Fort Dupont Park and the very interesting and inspiring upper Potomac Gorge; but in many cases it has been possible to utilize parts of the major parks for organized recreation.

13. In order to utilize most effectively the funds available, they were first largely expended on the purchase of open ground still available without expensive improvements. This has manifestly been a great economy to the taxpayers, and provided grounds which could be developed with Lanham-Act funds when the war caused a real emergency demand for more recreational facilities. In recent years the program, having been substantially carried out as to such available areas, the Commission has had to begin purchasing land for playgrounds and recreation areas in the congested and built-up parts of the city. Of course, as you all know, this is expensive, but no more expensive and in some cases less expensive than it would have been 10 or 14 years ago, whereas the then available open ground has been saved.

14. Considerable assistance has been received from patriotic and helpful residents, who donated some of their estates for the public use. Such donations amount to 13.25 acres, valued at $49,200.

15. In all, 20 recreation centers and 43 smaller units have been acquired; one more recreation center and 8 units are still proposed for which the ground will not have to be acquired. Nine recreation centers and 24 smaller units are located in the larger parks, and 13 recreations centers and 71 smaller units are located partly on school property. We find it is economical, both in first cost and in the cost of operation, to have adequate playgrounds connected with the schools, so that the facilities in the school building can be used by the children at play even when the school is not otherwise in use, thus saving the cost of a field house and some maintenance charges which would be necessary for playgrounds not so served.

PARK AREA IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA June 8, 1944

Type	Prior to NCP&PC	Acquired & being acquired by NCP&PC	Total–1944
1. Rock Creek Park	1,544.5 ac.	134.8 ac.	1,679.3 ac.
2. Stream Valleys feeding R. C.	18.1	127.3	145.4
3. Other stream valleys	218.6	331.2	609.8
4. Forts & Batteries	16.5	533.1	549.6
5. Fort Drive	–	718.1	718.1
6. Potomac River Parks	–	302.3	302.3
7. Connecting Parkways	–	54.7	54.7
8. Recreation System	262.8	288.9	551.7
9. Entrances, Squares and Plazas	–	0.4	0.4
10. Neighborhood parks, triangles and Misc.	1,316.0	45.4	1,361.4
11. Rights in Land	–	10.2	10.2
TOTALS	3,436.5 ac.	2,546.4 ac.	5,982.9 ac.
Other public lands transferred to park			684.3
Total park area, May 27, 1944			6,667.2 ac.

16. To provide employment for persons released from the Armed forces and from war industry, the most urgent public construction programs, both Federal and municipal, are being studied and listed and arranged according to their urgency to meet with estimates of cost for each, so that the most appropriate project can be undertaken as circumstances dictate. To assist the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and to perform the part which the citizens of the National Capital can do for themselves, the Board of Trade has organized a Postwar Planning Committee which is making excellent progress in its studies of anticipated employment by private enterprise.

17. From the foregoing it may be seen that both the Governmental agencies and the citizens of the National Capital are alert to the serious problems that will have to be faced upon the victorious conclusion of the war. A peculiarity of the National Capital is the fact that the municipal government has no legislative or appropriating power itself and the Congress of the United States is practically the city council; therefore, legislation and appropriation of funds must wait upon action by Congress. In such matters Congress reflects nationwide sentiment—and current trends are toward making the Capital not only an outstanding exemplar for American cities but worthy among world capitals of becoming a pivotal point in the postwar world.

18. There is always the danger that, in planning for the future, our enthusiasm may run away with our better judgment and lead us to for-

get that all these projects have to be paid for. It seems to me that a carry-over of the war psychology, which has brought us to the determination that we must do everything necessary to win the war regardless of its cost, may make us more forgetful than usual of the economic problems to be met. As we cannot foresee now just what the economic situation is going to be in the National Capital, any more than in any other city, upon the victorious conclusion of the war, I have no criterion to offer you by which we can measure in advance what projects will be practicable to carry out, and which will have to be postponed for a considerable length of time. However, we expect our postwar planning to include a priority for each project based upon its immediate economic benefit or return. This seems to be the most we can do on this problem at the present time; but we are looking for good advice and suggestions in this regard as in all of our planning problems.

19. The popularity of Washington as a tourist center is now crystallizing in organized movements to make the Capital truly great in every respect. Ten national professional and civic organizations, with a backlog of individual contributions to the upbuilding of the Capital, have united to work through a "Joint Committee on the National Capital" for the achievement of perfection in their various fields. This is a challenge to each and all of us, who want to make our Capital an adequate expression of our culture, to make some tangible offering to the same end. The well-considered and far-sighted report on the development of the city, drafted by the Bureau of the Budget and recently approved by the President, will offer an opportunity, when translated into appropriate legislation, to safeguard for all time the orderly development of the Federal City. It is a notable presentation of a fine ideal and it is to be hoped that all interests will unite for its consummation, so that the city shall, in the President's phrase, always be "the highest expression of our culture."

IN THE STATES

State Park Review

Alabama. James L. Segrest, Chief of the Division of State Parks, Monuments and Historical Sites in the Department of Conservation, reports that no new parks were acquired, no new facilities built during the year, though two three-inch wells were bored and 16 miles of telephone rebuilt. All of the eight state parks were open to the public, bringing in 142,017 visitors, with cabin and room facilities used to the limit from May 1 to August 31 and camp grounds used to about 70 percent of capacity. During the summer months double the cabin capacity could have been used. In spite of handicaps and difficulties the reward for keeping the parks open was in the relaxation furnished to members of the armed forces and war workers.

California. A. E. Henning, Chief of the Division of Beaches and Parks of the Department of Natural Resources, reports that two new parks have been added to the system—Will Rogers State Park, Los Angeles, 186 acres and Jackson Valley State Park in Mendocino County, 45 acres. Two notable additions have been made—200 acres added to Mill Creek State Park and 350 acres to Humboldt Redwoods State Park. During the year no new facilities were built and no major improvements made. All of the parks were in use by the public except those in use by the armed forces of the United States. All of the cabin and room facilities were used to maximum capacity, but camp grounds and picnic areas were used about 50 percent of their capacity.

Florida. Lewis G. Scoggin, Director of State Parks in the Forest and Park Service, reports that during 1944 one new park was acquired—the Collier-Seminole State Park, with an acreage of 5,783. No new facilities were built and no major improvements made. All of the seven parks were open to the public, except the Highlands Hammock which was on a restricted basis and used mostly by service men for recreation. There were 40,961 paid admissions during the year and it is estimated that at least that number of service men and others entered the parks free of charge. Cabins and rooms were used to 30 percent and picnic grounds to 75 percent of capacity. It is noteworthy that the budget for 1944 amounted to a little over $100,000.

Georgia. R. Ward Harrison, Director of the Department of State Parks in the State Division of Conservation, reported that during 1944 the Georgia State Parks had enjoyed the best attendance in their history, due in part to restrictions on travel which induced many Georgians to look for vacation facilities near home. Numerous soldiers, sailors and

marines were entertained, especially in Pine Ridge State Park which lies only 30 miles from Fort Benning, the largest infantry school in the world. Every possible effort was put forth to make Georgia's State Parks a vital contribution to the war effort. Cabins, rooms, camping grounds and picnic areas were used to a greater extent than ever before although not quite to the limit of capacity. There were no new acquisitions as the State now owns an adequate number of desirable sites for state parks not yet developed. There was no building of new facilities, but repairs and maintenance were carried on constantly and the close of the war should find present park facilities in a good state of preservation and ready for further expansion and development. All the developed State Parks were open during the 1944 season. The parks in Northern Georgia close for the winter but those in Southern Georgia remain open throughout the winter.

Illinois. George W. Williams, Superintendent of Parks and Memorials, Department of Public Works and Buildings, reports that Illinois acquired no new state parks during 1944, but action was started for acquiring a new state park as a memorial to the late Governor Frank O. Lowden. With money appropriated by the State Legislature for a Lowden Memorial, and with money raised by the people of Oregon and other towns near the Lowden home, it is expected that a beautiful wooded area along the Rock River just above Oregon may be purchased. This land includes the historic Eagle Nest Bluff, Ganymede Springs and the famous Lorado Taft statue *Black Hawk.*

During the year additional land was acquired for Starved Rock, 384.8 acres; Matthiessen State Park Nature Area, 174.6 acres; Red Hills, 129.5 acres; New Salem, 3.8 acres; and Black Hawk, .3 acres. No new major facilities or improvements were made during the year, but considerable work was done at the park lodges. At Starved Rock, White Pines Forest and Pere Marquette all exterior trim was refinished and the interior of all rooms repainted. All of the Starved Rock Lodge lounge furniture was recovered in bright new fabrics and colorful draperies hung in lounge and dining room. Two of the historical courthouses and three of the historic houses of state memorials had the exteriors completely repaired and all surfaces painted. The interior of the Lincoln Home was painted. A recreation room in the basement of the Watch Tower at Black Hawk State Park was constructed with asphalt-tile floor, plastered walls and insulated ceiling. A garage at Cave-In-Rock was converted into a pleasing five-room stone and timber custodian's residence. Numerous warehouses were constructed from salvaged material from abandoned CCC buildings in major parks.

All of the parks have been open with all of their usual facilities available for the public. Attendance has shown a ten percent increase over 1943 with an attendance of about 2,100,000. The unusually fine fall

weather and a substantial increase of visitors at several of the memorials accounts for much of this increase. Lodge and cabin facilities were used to their limit during the season but all of the lodges except Starved Rock have been closed for the winter. Starved Rock Lodge continues to do a capacity business. The Wagon Wheel Inn at New Salem, which was closed during 1943 because of flood damage, was opened and did a good business. There was a good use of picnic facilities and a fair use of camping areas. Riding, boat and other concessions were in operation during the season and had a fair business. A record number of youth groups availed themselves of the parks and this included group camps in the Pere Marquette Vacation Area, which was formerly a Federal Recreational Area.

The Military continued their use of the parks. A thousand or more engineer corpsmen from Camp Ellis were stationed at Starved Rock earlier in the year. Here groups received a month's training in building pontoon, foot and assault boat bridges and various other types of river operations essential to mobile warfare. While at the park, the army built several permanent roads. Troops from Scott Flying Field held regular over-night bivouacs at Cahokia Mounds. The Illinois State Militia held three to four-day training periods at Kickapoo and Giant City State Parks.

A major effort has been the formulating of postwar plans. A program has been worked out with projects that over several years involve an expenditure of over $7,000,000, which will give Illinois a park system ranking with the best in the country.

Indiana. Charles DeTurk, Director of State Parks, Lands and Waters of the Department of Conservation, reports that there was no new land acquisition to increase the number of parks and memorials during the year, but all the remaining unowned tracts within Brown County State Park, totaling 120 acres, were purchased. No new facilities were added. One major improvement was completed at Lincoln State Park in Spencer County. CCC had constructed a 20-acre lake and this year the dam was raised ten feet to make a lake of about 80 acres.

None of the parks was closed during the year. All park areas and facilities were operated as usual. There were 562,000 paid admissions, compared to 442,000 in 1943. All the park hotels and cabins, as well as group camps, were used to full capacity during the entire season. There were 21,000 requests for reservations at Potawatomi Inn in Pokagon State Park and the total facilities allowed the management to take care of 1,800 from January 1 to December 1. All the other park inns had the same experience. The camp groups were used much less than in prewar years, only about 10 percent of their capacity being used. Swimming pools and beaches, however, were used as much or more than in any previous year.

There is every indication that there is a definite need and use for active outdoor recreational facilities. Those parks in which active recreation is the major attraction suffered less loss of attendance than the strictly scenic or historical areas.

Iowa. V. W. Flickinger, recently a Captain in the Army, Chief of the Division of Lands and Waters, Iowa State Conservation Commission, reports that in 1944 the following areas were added to the system:

McIntosh Woods, North shore of Clear Lake	60 acres State Preserve
Abbie Gardner Sharp, Lake Okoboji Region	1 acre State Monument
Glenwood, West of town of Glenwood	68 acres State Wayside
	129 acres

Work was continued in surveys and investigations to complete the National Monument areas in Allamakee and Clayton Counties. Restoration work on various historical monuments was carried on through the biennium, including Ft. Atkinson and the Governor Lucas Home at Iowa City. There was very little construction, but the group camp at Springbrook, which was a former CCC camp was rebuilt and made available in 1944. The Youth Camp building at Keomah was made usable and a road built to it. Cabins in Lacey-Keosauqua and Lake of Three Fires, which had been under construction in 1943, were completed in time for the 1944 season. A total of 68 cabins for family use and about 25 cabins for group camps are now available. The cabins were popular and most of the season booked to capacity. The decrease in use by juvenile groups has been more than offset by increase in use by adult groups. The camp grounds were not much used and the picnic grounds could have accommodated at least 75 percent more people than actually visited them. About 12,418 used the cabins, 33,422 the lodges, 6,729 the group camping cabins and 9,007 the tent and trailer camping facilities. Because of the difficulty in securing concessionaires the Commission itself operated a few of the facilities, but serious floods interfered with attendance.

The Forestry program was almost at a standstill because the foresters were in the armed forces. No planting was done but some fencing was installed. The Division owns and operates the Forest Nursery in Story County which supplies trees to farmers for windbreak demonstrations and soil and water conservation projects, but fewer trees were distributed because of labor shortage.

A postwar program of some $28,000,000 has been outlined.

Louisiana. William W. Wells, Acting Director of the State Parks Commission, reports that 1944 was the peak year for park use in Louisiana, due of course to the fact that the two major parks, Chicot and Fountainebleau, were opened for the first time in midsummer of 1943.

One new park area of 1,047 acres was acquired. It is located near Lake Charles and will be developed to serve the southwestern part of the State. It was named Sam Houston. Funds have been made available to prepare development plans and to start construction when conditions permit. The only new building undertaken was the construction of an experiment station at Chicot State Park for use by the Department of Conservation in carrying out experiments in lake management and wildlife control. No major improvements were made but the organization and operation of the parks were perfected. A revolving fund for the operation of various facilities, such as a bathhouse, cabins and refreshment stands, was provided by the Legislature. This allowed the State Parks Commission to take over the operation of these facilities and to provide better service than that rendered under the former concession-form of operation.

All parks were opened to the public and were visited by 120,000 patrons, more than double the attendance for 1943. The ten cabins at Chicot were used to capacity for the entire season and it was necessary to turn down as many as forty to fifty requests on some weekends. The cabins at Chemin-A-Haut, which is more isolated than Chicot, were used to about 40 percent of capacity. No camping grounds have been developed. Picnic grounds were heavily used at all parks and present facilities at Chicot were taxed to the utmost on many Sundays. The large picnic area at Fontainebleau was heavily used but not crowded.

Probably the major item of interest is the wildlife management program being put into effect on most areas to restore and protect native fauna. For this $50,000 has been made available.

Massachusetts. Edgar L. Gillette, Director of the Division of Parks and Recreation of the Department of Conservation, advises us that during the past year the Commonwealth of Massachusetts was given one of the most beautiful estates in the entire State, to be known as the Bradley W. Palmer State Park, in the towns of Hamilton, Ipswich and Topsfield, comprising a little more than 700 acres. Plans for development are now under way, but the area is not yet open to the public.

No new facilities were added nor were any major improvements made. All parks and recreational areas were open during the season, except for two areas, where there is a duplication of facilities, which have been closed for the duration. Seven of the state parks were open as usual, together with recreational areas on twenty-five state forests. The total attendance for the summer recreational season was estimated to be 1,582,780. The 1941 figure was 1,680,597. This is a good indication that after the war we may expect a greater number of people by far than ever before. The cabins on certain areas were used to capacity. On others the usage was light. Camping grounds were used considerably more this year than in the past two years but nowhere near to capacity nor to the

1941 level. Day picnicking showed the greatest increase in usage. Most of the increase in attendance was from this source. It was noticeable that public conveyances were used to capacity wherever available and that the average number of persons per pleasure car was about double the average in 1941.

Michigan. W. J. Kingscott, Chief of the State Parks Division of the Department of Conservation, writes that the acquisition of areas from July 1, 1943 to June 30, 1944, included two new recreation areas, Waterloo with 3,748 acres and Yankee Springs with 4,200 acres, and two additions, one at Warren Dunes State Park of 117 acres and one at Wilderness State Park of 143 acres. No new facilities have been built or major improvements made.

Fifty-two parks and recreation areas were open to the public. Four parks were closed because of the war emergency. The attendance to October 1, 1944, came to 5,010,000. The State does not operate cabins or rooms. Camp grounds were used probably at one-fourth of capacity, picnic grounds to one-third of capacity. Park use in general showed an increase over 1943. General attendance was 26 percent greater and camp days 36 percent greater than in 1943. There were more Michigan campers than non-residents in the ratio of 43 to 11. Campers from 27 States outside of Michigan were registered as compared with 26 in 1943.

Minnesota. Harold W. Lathrop, Director, Division of State Parks, Department of Conservation, reports that no new parks were established but that the following additions were made: Old Crossing Treaty Wayside, 101 acres and Jay Cooke State Park, 240 acres. The total area of the Minnesota State Park System on July 1, 1944 was 81,543 acres. No new facilities were provided and no major improvements made. All of the 42 parks were open to the public. About 930,000 persons visited the parks as determined by daily estimates. Cabins and rooms were used to the limit. Camp grounds were used only about five percent of capacity. Picnic grounds, based on average for 1941, were used about 50 percent of capacity. Douglas Lodge, a state-operated resort in Itasca State Park, enjoyed a record number of guest days, due, no doubt, to the fact that 75 percent of the guests arrived by bus and remained from 10 to 14 days. After two years of reduced group camping, 1944 showed a resumption of camping at about a normal level.

Mississippi. Bura Hilbun, Coördinator of Forests and Parks of the Forest and Park Commission, writes that Magnolia State Park has received an addition in the form of one complete CCC camp for group camping, with a capacity of 300 and an acreage of 50. The buildings, grounds and equipment, valued at $40,000, were given to the park. A $50,000 spillway for the lake at Percy Quin State Park has been built.

Only six of the ten parks were open to the public. Four were closed for lack of funds to operate, but all will be open in the spring of 1945. Cabins and rooms were used to about 75 percent of capacity. There are no camp grounds in any of the State's parks. Picnic grounds were used to about 90 percent of the limit. Two parks operated group camps with a capacity for 200 people this year. Four will operate group camps in 1945 with a capacity of 600 people.

Nevada. Robert A. Allen, *Ex Officio* Superintendent of State Parks, under the State Park Commission, reports that there were no acquisitions during the year, no facilities built and the only improvements consisted in dragging a road into some of the areas, which were all open to the public at all times. Travel along the roads and into the parks was very small during 1944.

New Jersey. H. C. Black, Landscape Architect for the Department of Conservation and Development, remarks that the 1944 season has shown a greatly increased demand for certain types of recreational facilities in state parks and forests, as compared to previous years. The increase has been most marked in the use of cabins which were occupied to capacity throughout the season. Requests for reservations were far in excess of available accommodations. Acquisitions in 1944 include a new state park area containing 835 acres in Morris County to be known as Farny State Park, a 927-acre addition to Belleplain State Forest, 105 acres to connect the two heretofore separated Voorhees State Park areas, and a five-acre addition to Parvin State Park. In addition, 54,333 acres of tax-lien land in the southern part of the State have been accepted for future development as state forests.

The only new facilities erected during the year have been an administrative office at Swartswood Park, a superintendent's residence at Voorhees State Park, and an equipment building and shop at Parvin State Park. The only major improvement was the first section of a retaining wall along the Delaware River at Washington Crossing State Park to prevent serious erosion. The job will be completed as funds are available.

All of the eight state forests were open to the public and all but one of the twelve state parks. The exception was the 21-acre Mount Laurel State Park which was turned over to the Army for its exclusive use. The attendance for the year to December 1, was 404,647. Cabins were used to the limit, camp grounds in the state parks to about 30 percent of capacity and in the state forests to 60 percent. Picnic grounds in the state parks had approximately 40 percent use and in the state forests 15 percent. This use reflects the restrictions on automobile travel, the day visitor and short-time user of facilities giving way to those who can spend a longer time.

During the year, five CCC camps have been turned over to the State. At Parvin State Park, the former CCC camp is being used as a prisoner-of-war camp. The Armed Forces have made extensive use of most of the forests and parks in their training programs.

New York. The Division of Parks of the Conservation Department, James F. Evans, Director, reports that no new acquisitions were made during the year. There were three additions, amounting to 161 acres. No new facilities and no major improvements were added. All seventy of the parks were open to the public and the number of visitors through October of 1944 totaled 7,425,000. Cabins, rooms and camping grounds were used to the limit but picnic facilities were used to about 85 percent of capacity. The twelve months' attendance for 1943 came to 4,600,000 as compared with the 11 months' attendance in 1944 of 7,425,000. There were increased revenues in 1944 as compared to 1943.

North Carolina. R. J. Pearse, Acting Superintendent of State Parks in the Department of Conservation and Development, reports that by completing the purchase of over 150 acres of interior tracts of land, Crabtree State Park now contains over 5,000 acres. A new state park of 350 acres, to be called *The Cliffs*, has been approved for acceptance by the Department and the land is being made available by the donations of public-spirited citizens of Goldsboro. The park is remarkably beautiful and contains unusual plant combinations such as Spanish moss, galax, mountain laurel and southern cypress all growing within the area of a city block. A population of 35,000 lives within a radius of 50 miles. No new facilities have been added and no major improvements made in the system.

Although the present biennial budget was set up on a non-operating basis, it was decided that seven parks would be opened to the public this season for limited use. Two of these parks had never been open except for picnic operation. Shortly after the season opened, the polio epidemic became so dangerous that all parks were closed to children under 15 years of age. This was a blow not only to the public use of the parks but also to numerous group camps. All of the camps curtailed their camping period but some of them filled their quota of campers.

Hanging Rock State Park near Winston-Salem was opened on July 4 to the public for the first time for the use of bathhouse, beach and fishing in the lake. An early season extensive use was reduced by the polio restriction. Morrow Mountain State Park near Albemarle was to be opened July 15, but one week's camp for a Boy Scout troop was the only use of the park except for picnic facilities. Jones Lake near Elizabethtown in the Bladen Lakes Recreation Area was opened July 1 for operation. This is the only state-operated Negro recreation area in the State. Early season extensive operation was curtailed by the epidemic.

The camping at Crabtree State Park between Raleigh and Durham and at Singletary Lake in Bladen County was closed early in the season by State Health restrictions. Fort Macon State Park near Morehead City was leased to the Coast Guard. Mount Mitchell State Park was open for visitors. In spite of difficult access roads, there was an average of 25 visitors per day. A new planned state highway, leading from the Blue Ridge Parkway, four and a half miles to Mount Mitchell State Park, will make this park very popular in the postwar period.

North Dakota. Russell Reid, Superintendent of State Parks for the State Historical Society of North Dakota, reports that no new state parks were added to the system and there were no additions to parks or historic sites. There were no additional park facilities and no major improvements, though all existing structures were repaired and repainted. All state parks and historic sites were kept open to the public. The number of visitors was estimated at 75,000. Cabins were used to about 60 percent of capacity, camping grounds to 30 percent and picnic grounds to 75 percent. Attendance at state parks showed some increase over 1943 but will not return to normal until travel restrictions can be removed.

Ohio. W. R. Wheelock, Chief of Inland Lakes and Parks Section of the Division of Conservation and Natural Resources, reports the acquisition of an area of 1,150 acres on Lake Erie on East Harbor at the junction of Catawba Island and Marblehead Peninsula, a few miles northwest of Sandusky. There is every prospect that six park developments will be authorized by the Conservation Commission for about 2,100 acres for general conservation and recreational use. Extensions were made to picnic grounds, bathing beaches, parking areas and tent and trailer camp areas in Buckeye Lake, Lake St. Mary's, Indian Lake, Mt. Gilead Lakes, Guilford Lake and Pymatuning Lake.

As major improvements, a bridge necessary to the entrance of Lake Loramie recreation area was partly completed; the south fork of Lake Loramie was reopened by dredging a mile of forty-foot channel; a public parking area and boat launching slip were built near Portage Lakes; two groups of desirable cottage sites on Buckeye Lake were improved by dredge and bulldozer; Jefferson Lake was open to boating for the first time; the breakwater at Catawba Island State Park on Lake Erie was partly rebuilt; a long recreation pier at Mt. Gilead Lake was extended 100 feet out from the shore line; at Pymatuning Lake the bed of a new road 2,900 feet long was cleared and graded to open traffic to the north recreational area; at Roosevelt State Park a check dam was built to prevent the silting of the lake; at South Bass Island Park materials were assembled for reconstruction of the breakwater; at Lake Alma an emergency overflow outlet was constructed. New facilities include a comfort

station at Buckeye Lake, dressing enclosures for bathers at four parks, additions to caretakers' lodges at Roosevelt Park, Independence Park and Lake St. Mary's, and the partial building of an office at Indian Lake. The office at Lake Loramie was moved to a new site and a double boathouse extension partly completed.

All twenty-one of Ohio's parks were open to the public. It is estimated from sale of boating privileges and reports that the attendance of 1944 at least equaled the record of any previous year. A conservative estimate of attendance would be 2,500,000 park visitors or 11,000,000 visitor days. Use of camping grounds did not exceed 30 percent of former years. Use of picnic grounds was somewhat reduced, running perhaps 75 percent of previous years.

Oklahoma. Donald E. Stauffer, Supervisor of State Parks, Division of Forestry and State Parks of the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, reports that there were no new acquisitions during the year, no new facilities and no major improvements. All the parks but one were open to the public. The closed park was used for training purposes by the the U. S. Army Air Forces. The total number of visitors will exceed 750,000. Cabins were used to the limit. Camping facilities were used only to about five percent of space available. Picnicking was heavy, especially on weekends and holidays.

Oregon. Sam H. Boardman, State Parks Superintendent under the State Highway Commission, writes that for the past three years "we have been operating under a slow bell, only maintenance receiving funds and attention." The acquisition program has moved steadily forward. There were three new parks: Seneca Fouts Memorial in Hood River County, a gift of 160 acres; Jennie B. Harris State Park in Lane County, a gift of 4 acres; and Ukiah–Dale Forest Wayside in Umatilla County, a purchase of 2,461.9 acres. Additions comprise: 375 acres purchased for Wolf Creek Park in Columbia and Washington Counties; 58 acres purchased for Booth Park in Lake County; 29.62 acres purchased for Ocean Waysides in Lincoln County; 80 acres purchased for Silver Creek Falls in Marion County; and 320 acres donated to Short Sand Beach in Tillamook County. There were no new facilities and no major improvements. Thirty-three parks were open to the public, six parks were closed by military authorities. Some 500,000 visitors came into the parks. There are no cabins and no overnight camping grounds in the system. Picnic grounds were used to about one-third of capacity.

Pennsylvania. Milford Bratton, Director of the Bureau of Parks in the Department of Forests and Waters, writes that there were no acquisitions, no new facilities except park signs, and no major improvements. All the parks were open to the public. Cabins and rooms were

used to the limit for the season June 1–September 5, but camp and picnic grounds were less used.

South Carolina. J. H. Gadsby, Acting State Park Director, under the State Commission of Forestry, states that there were no acquisitions during the year. A temporary building was erected at Oconee State Park to serve as a combination recreation hall, dining-room and kitchen. Materials for this were secured largely from portable buildings in an old CCC camp which had been abandoned to the owner of the property where they stood. From the same materials a small house for the Chief Ranger and summer quarters for the Concessionaire and his help were built. Improvements were made at Paris Mountain State Park, including a flight of rock steps from bathhouse to beach, a fence and a new concrete floor in the bathhouse.

All the parks except one have been continuously open to the public. Myrtle Beach State Park was occupied by the Armed Forces concerned with beach patrol, but these forces have been withdrawn and the park will be returned to the system for operation in 1945. Hunting Island State Park has only a restricted area accessible to the public, as the Navy is using a part of the area for gunnery practice. At Edisto Beach State Park, the bathhouse has not been kept open but the beach and picnic facilities have been used to some extent. The estimated number of visitors to all state parks during 1944 season was 536,400. All of the cabins were used to the limit. Though camping generally has not found much favor in the South, the group camp areas inherited from the National Park Service would have been filled to capacity had it not been for the infantile paralysis epidemic which caused a large number of cancellations. The picnic grounds were used to the limit and on Sundays and holidays there were never enough accommodations to meet the demand. It is remarkable that, in spite of restrictions on transportation and other obstacles, so many people were able to get to the parks.

South Dakota. Mr. E. L. Burns, Acting Superintendent of Custer State Park, reports that there have been no additions to the Park during the year and construction has been limited to necessities. The main project has been a slaughter and freezing plant for elk and buffalo meat. As large elk and buffalo herds are maintained in the park for tourist interest, it is important to regulate and control the animals in order that the natural feed may remain abundant. For this reason as well as to provide more income for the park, a quantity of meat has been supplied from the herds.

The entire park has been open to the public, with visitors totalling about 175,000, consisting largely of Service men and their relatives. Cabins and rooms were used to 50 percent, camp grounds to 40 percent and picnic grounds to 35 percent of capacity.

Tennessee. From the Annual Report of William H. Hay, Director of the Division of State Parks, Department of Conservation, we present the following brief résumé. Since the establishment of the State Parks Division in 1937–38, fifteen parks have been established, twelve of them containing facilities, aggregating about 125,000 acres. During 1944, negotiations for the acquisition of the 16,000-acre Fall Creek Park in Van Buren and Bledsoe Counties and the 13,000-acre Shelby Forest Park in Shelby County were completed and Governor Cooper accepted the deeds from the National Park Service in June.

Although wartime travel restrictions have limited the day-use of parks, special attention has been given to the men of the Armed Forces. Large numbers of them were served at Harrison Bay and Cedars of Lebanon State Parks. Activities were planned for the men, including regular dances, square dances, ping pong tournaments and picnics. From the beginning of the summer season at Harrison Bay the boat dock was filled to capacity and rental boats were in demand. Lights flood the docks at night. All parks containing vacation cabins had full use of these facilities. At Chickasaw Park, the Southern States Fox Hunt was held again with the highest attendance to date.

The State Parks Division received a grant of Federal funds to sponsor a program of assistance to communities in the operation of soldiers' recreation centers. Maneuver Recreation Committees were set up in 21 communities. Volunteer workers in this connection served a total of 72,785 hours. Attendance figures show that over one million men were given free showers, over a million and a half attended the soldier centers, 196,000 attended dances.

In August of 1942 a coöperative agreement was entered into with TVA by which the Division of State Parks assists and works with the Authority in planning recreational use of all the Reservoir properties in Tennessee.

The Division has outlined on paper a $2,000,000 postwar development program.

Texas. Frank D. Quinn, Executive Director of the Texas State Parks Board, reports that in the early part of 1944 an area of some 600 acres of typical tropical jungle, located in Hidalgo County, on the Rio Grande, was donated to the Parks Board and is now called Bentsen Rio Grande Valley State Park. During the year construction was completed on a concession building at Cleburne State Park; major additions were made to the manager's residence at Meridian State Park, the assistant Manager's dwelling at Bastrop State Park was rebuilt after being destroyed by fire; a cabin was constructed at Possum Kingdom State Park, where five additional cabin units and a caretaker's house are now under construction.

All of the 36 state parks were open to the public during the entire

year and the attendance was over 2,000,000. Cabins and lodges were used to the limit, and camping and picnic grounds were crowded on weekends. Total receipts from the operation of concessions were the greatest in the history of the parks, though Texas parks suffered as did others from lack of adequate manpower.

A tract of over 700,000 acres, purchased by and through the Texas State Parks Board at a cost of over $1,500,000, was accepted during the year by the Federal Government as the Big Bend National Park.

Vermont. Robert G. Simon, Assistant in charge of State Parks and Recreation, operated as a part of the Forest Service of the Department of Natural Resources, states that Vermont acquired no new park areas during the year, though 30 acres of land were acquired and added to the Ascutney State Forest Park at Windsor. No new facilities were provided and no major improvements made. Only fourteen of the twenty-three recreational areas in the state parks and forests were open to the public in 1944. Because of manpower limitations, the areas showing low attendance in previous years were not opened. Only 54,205 persons visited Vermont's state recreational areas during the year, and this was double the number of visitors for 1943. Gasoline rationing was the cause.

Necessary upkeep was carried on by a roving maintenance crew in areas not operated. The out-of-State automobiles counted at the areas had a 14 percent rise over 1943, amounting to 35.8 percent of the total number of cars. The number of camper days was practically the same as during the previous season. None of the facilities in the parks was overtaxed.

Virginia. Warren Wright, Acting Assistant Director of Parks under the Virginia Conservation Commission, reports that Sailor's Creek Historical Park, containing 219.59 acres, was added to the State Park system during 1944. No new facilities were added and no major improvements made. In 1943 only the picnic areas were open, but in 1944, the facilities of four parks were open to the public except cabins and restaurants. At Seashore Park the picnic areas were open and the cabins were made available to military personnel and their families on a seasonal basis. At Staunton River Park only the picnic areas were open.

During the early part of the 1944 season the daily attendance in some parks approached that of normal years, but the polio epidemic caused a sharp decrease in attendance in the latter part of the season. In the four parks in which most of the facilities were available the attendance was 116,940. All available cabins were used; if cabins in all the parks had been open they would have been filled; but the camping grounds in the four parks in which these areas were open were used to about 30 percent of capacity.

West Virginia. R. B. Griffith, Chief, Division of State Parks of the Conservation Commission, reports that one new area of 150 areas was acquired for eventual development as day use. No new facilities were added and no major improvements made. Some minor improvements were made to the Inn at Watoga, and a park road at Tomlinson Run State Park was paved by State Roads Commission and County Court. All parks were open to the public. The estimated attendance was about 40 percent of normal. All cabins and inn rooms were used to full capacity and the demand far exceeded the supply. There are no camping grounds in the system. Picnic grounds were used to about 40 percent of normal, though areas close to centers of population reached nearly to the maximum.

New Hampshire[1]. Russell B. Tobey, Director of Recreation of the Forestry and Recreation Department, reports that operations in many state parks were delayed because many of seasonal supervisors were not available. However, before summer weather set in, 15 parks out of 21 normally operated were open for public use. Many of the new personnel at these areas were severely tried when early in the season extremely warm weather brought about heavy and prolonged patronage. The areas that were not operated were those inaccessible because of travel conditions and in the main the smaller areas. We were impressed with the reports from several of the larger areas indicating the extent to which visitors would go to overcome the lack of automobiles. Many came by bicycle, some on foot, hiking several miles for each visit. One industrial group of 500 chartered a train of coal cars in which wooden seats were placed and rode to within walking distance of a park. The increased use of a specially prepared group picnic area was most satisfactory. Groups as large as 600 were able to enjoy this particular spot without disturbing large numbers of family picnic groups who retained the use of the other part of the park. A close estimate indicates that general attendance for 1944 doubled the previous year at the same number of parks.

The park personnel, doubling in their duties, were able to prevent any forest fires and any drownings. Camper days increased three times over the previous year, due to longer visits per party rather than greater number of campers. Those parks readily accessible to centers of population were used heavily. Picnicking increased more than swimming.

No new areas were added to those operated in the past nor any extension of facilities. It was necessary to carry out two major repair operations due to the failure of a dam and a water system. Otherwise even normal maintenance work was neglected because funds and man power were lacking.

[1]Received too late to place in order.

Saint Louis, a Planned City

HON. A. P. KAUFMANN, Mayor of Saint Louis

THE American Planning and Civic Association returns to Saint Louis, the city of its nativity forty years ago, at a most significant time, and we are happy to welcome home the distinguished members of this Conference. Your visit offers us an opportunity to review the past, and to appraise the future of our community. I believe you will approve, not only what we have done, but what we plan to do as well.

We have launched a two-pronged attack upon what we regard as inadequacies of the present. More clearly to outline the plan, I should first recall what many of you already know, and that is, the bold transformation in our city that resulted from the great $87,000,000 bond issue approved by our citizens in 1923. The funds provided by this issue, swept away an unsightly core and substituted a great and beautiful municipal plaza, flanked by useful and imposing public buildings. Nor were we content only with improvements that challenged the eye. We also extended our water and sewage systems, vital items in the preservation of the public health.

These great gains have been consolidated, but a city's needs still call for new advances after most careful planning. We are submitting to our people, for a vote on August 1st next, a new bond issue of approximately $43,000,000,[1] which, with other available and anticipated funds, will admit of a postwar program of $63,000,000, This program has been planned with an eye to minimum maintenance costs after construction, and to maximum provision for wages for men and women to be employed in completing it. This program is designed, not only to meet the need for expanded and enlarged municipal services and facilities, but to provide immediate employment to discharged service men and production-line workers.

It is obvious, of course, that a major phase of this program is airport enlargement and new airport acquisition. From this vital element, the program stems out to include additional hospital facilities, improved streets and highways, expanded water and sewer facilities, and a great recreational plan. Some of the benefits of the whole program are: jobs; improved public health; minimized delinquency, and the increased commerce that a city with initiative in airport planning has a right to expect.

The other prong of our attack upon the future, is a plan for the redevelopment of blighted areas. During the last session of the Legislature, we secured passage of a bill extending, under proper safeguards, the right of condemnation to private business for the purpose of rebuilding blighted areas. This plan is now progressing under the sponsorship of a

[1]Bond Issue approved.

group headed by Mr. L. Wade Childress and advised by Harland Bartholomew.

Thus, our whole program includes the concerted action of the City and private business; pledging the public credit for one phase of the program and private credit for the remainder. The result will be an employment reservoir that will be important during the period that it takes industry to retool after the war and embark upon peacetime production.

We shall follow your deliberations with intense interest, for there will be much profit in them for our community. To each of you I extend the welcome of our city, and its gratitude for the inspiration that you and your Association have been to us through the years.

The Saint Louis Plan in Action

HARLAND BARTHOLOMEW, Engineer, City Planning Commission, Saint Louis, Mo.

IT WAS on April 1, 1916 that a new City Plan Commission received its initial appropriation, adopted a program of work and employed a staff to carry it out. The initial work was the preparation of a report "Problems of Saint Louis" in which were discussed the general nature of the city plan needed for Saint Louis and the specific studies which should be undertaken. The program then agreed upon consisted of the following:

River Des Peres	1916
Streets	1917
Transit	1920
Transportation	1922
Recreation	1917
Redistricting (Zoning)	1918
Housing	1920
Public Buildings	1919

Subsequent reports were published on each of these subjects. The dates shown indicate the year in which the report was issued. Each of these reports contained a plan which was designed to be a guide for the development of the city during the succeeding period of twenty-five years. Collectively these reports and plans represented a complete and comprehensive city plan for Saint Louis.

This was a pioneer undertaking. Only a few other American cities had attempted to prepare comprehensive city plans. There were no precedents to follow. There were no state laws authorizing the work. There was no well established procedure to follow. The only authority for the work was an ordinance passed by the Board of Aldermen in 1911. An earlier attempt to do this type of work for which a previous commission had been appointed had ended in failure.

The new city plan was accepted and followed by practically all ad-

ministrative offices of the City Government. In 1923 an $87,000,000 bond issue was approved by the electorate which made available funds for carrying out much of the work shown in the proposed city plan. This bond issue also included funds for other public improvements such as additional hospitals, water supply, sewers, street lighting and the like.

The original program was supplemented by a special study of the riverfront undertaken in 1925. Two reports were issued from this study:

A Plan for the Central Riverfront 1928
Plans for the Northern and Southern Riverfront . . . 1929

A report on Ten Years Progress on the city plan in Saint Louis was published in 1927. A special study of the integrated problems of population trends, land use, zoning and taxation was published in 1936 entitled "Urban Land Policy."

Thus for twenty-five years Saint Louis has followed consistently a comprehensive city plan. Something over fifty reports have been prepared, some of which have appeared only in mimeographed form. Over 8,500 maps, plans, drawings and studies have been prepared and are on file in the office of the Commission.

From the standpoint of comprehensive city planning, the City of Saint Louis has been one of the most active of the large American cities. The City is now equipped with a full quota of public improvements of modern design. We have a water supply that is unexcelled. The entire City's area is provided with sewers and storm water drains. An unusually complete system of wide, well paved and fully lighted main thoroughfares serve all parts of the City. Following is a brief description of a few of the larger Major Street widening and improvements completed during the past twenty-five years:

Lindell Boulevard from Grand to Channing was widened from 60 to 100 feet and opened to traffic in November, 1933.

From Channing east to Twelfth Street, a distance of two miles, Olive Street was widened from 60 to 100 feet at a cost of approximately $2,500,000, and opened to traffic in June, 1928.

Market Street was widened from 60 to 100 feet, a distance of over three miles, from Third and Walnut to Vandeventer Avenue at a cost of $6,200,000.

North Twelfth Boulevard and North Florissant Avenue were widened to 98 feet from Washington to Palm, at a cost of over $2,000,000.

Kingshighway Memorial Boulevard from Easton Avenue north to Penrose Park widened from 100 to 150 feet at a cost of $164,000, was opened to traffic in 1924.

Natural Bridge Avenue widened from 50 to 60 feet to 100 feet, typical eight-lane major street. The section of this street from Union Boulevard to the City Limits was widened by agreement among property owners without city participation.

Many neighborhood parks and playgrounds have been acquired and improved throughout the entire City's area. A large group of public buildings has been constructed around the Memorial Plaza. Seven

blocks were acquired for the Memorial Plaza at a cost of approximately $4,600,000. Of these, six comprising 9.54 acres are now devoted to open space. The Soldier's Memorial Building has been constructed at an approximate cost of $1,000,000. The Municipal Auditorium covers an area of almost six acres, and faces the Memorial Plaza. The Opera House seats 3,500 persons and the Convention Hall which cost approximately $5,000,000, seats 12,000. The Civil Court House, completed in 1930, is at the east end of the Plaza. Building and land cost about $5,600,000. Across the street from the Civil Court House is the new United States Court House and Custom House. Original buildings facing the plaza site consisted only of the City Hall, Municipal Courts Building and Public Library. Three blocks west of the Memorial Plaza is the Aloe Plaza comprising two blocks and having an area of 2.19 acres, which was acquired when Market Street was widened. The Fountain by Carl Milles, dedicated in 1940, depicts the Wedding of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers. As a result of the Aloe Plaza the beautiful facade of the Union Station can now be fully appreciated.

The entire Central Riverfront comprising all of thirty-nine, and a portion of three additional city blocks, has been acquired for approximately $7,700,000 by the City of Saint Louis and the United States Government for a National Monument to be known as the Jefferson National-Expansion Memorial.

On the other side of the ledger are several new problems of great magnitude, such as decentralization of population and of business, declining property values, especially in centrally located slum areas and large surrounding areas of blighted districts. However, as a first step in meeting these problems, two low-cost housing projects have been constructed, and the site for a third project has been acquired. The projects completed are: The Clinton–Peabody Terrace, a USHA project for 657 white families, which consists of 53 two- and three-story fire-proof buildings having a total of 2,972 rooms, at a total cost of approximately $3,500,000, and the Carr-Square Village, USHA low-rent housing project accommodating 658 Negro families, consisting of 53 two- and three-story fire-proof buildings with a total of 2,820 rooms in units of 3 to 6½ rooms, at a total cost of approximately $3,500,000.

The City Plan Commission was instrumental in having adopted a State Act providing for Urban Redevelopment Corporations, to permit the assembling of land for housing projects to be financed with private capital. The Report "Saint Louis After World War II," published by the City Plan Commission in 1942 suggests a realistic land program that should be carried out after the present war to solve one of the greatest economic and social problems that confronts Saint Louis.

There are still unsolved problems of street congestion. The Major Street Plan adopted in 1917 was revised in 1942 making certain recommendations for opening and widening of streets. One of the Major

Street undertakings, to be initiated after the war, will be an Interregional Highway from the southern city limits along the riverfront to the Jefferson Memorial Area, where it will then go on to the Third Street elevated roadway extending north of the Memorial Area, thence following the riverfront to the northern city limits. The projected Third Street elevated roadway was proposed by the City Plan Commission in its Central Riverfront Report published in 1928.

There is need for several additional neighborhood parks and playgrounds. In January 1944 the City Plan Commission completed its revision of the Master Recreation Plan and published a report entitled "Plan for Public Recreational Areas." The plan is an attempt to anticipate the City's needs in public recreational areas during the next two or three decades.

There is need for a new modern zoning ordinance which the Commission has drafted recently.

Introduction

HON. CHESTER C. DAVIS, President, Federal Reserve Bank, Saint Louis, Mo.

AT THE suggestion of the Program Committee, I am going to take a little more time to explain why the financial community is interested in postwar civic planning.

When this war ends, we will have an enormous national debt, perhaps 250 billions, perhaps 300 billions, perhaps more. This debt in itself need not defeat national progress, provided our future course as a Nation is enterprising and constructive. It is enormous, but so are our national resources. The annual cost of servicing the debt alone will be many times the amount of total Federal expenditures prior to World War I, but the debt will be destructively large only if we fail to use our resources in expanded production of the goods and services a rising standard of living can absorb to advantage.

This all spells out in jobs. When demobilization is complete, we face the necessity of furnishing employment for 55 million wage earners, compared with the peak of 46 million before the war. To furnish employment opportunities of this magnitude is primarily the responsibility of private industry, but the jobs must be had. I believe the day has passed when unemployment is not accepted as a responsibility of government. No matter what party or administration is in power, government will feel that responsibility; will try to pick up where private employment leaves off; will supplement private with public employment to the extent that is necessary. Many do not like that prospect, but there it is.

The real challenge is to be ready with worthwhile projects if and when the need hits us.

We all remember the hastily improvised Civil Works Administration program of 1933–34, aimed to give jobs, any kind of jobs, to four million men. We don't want any more of that. There is too much to do that is worthwhile; our cities are the places to plan and direct it.

Each one of us sees these problems from his own doorstep. Right here in Saint Louis, for example, opportunities stare us in the face. In spite of all that has been done, we might as well admit that downtown Saint Louis is ugly. The shore line of the Mississippi is ugly; so is the opposite shore line of our sister city, East Saint Louis. The opportunities for improvement as a community are unlimited. If we fail to develop these downtown areas, these shore lines, our air terminals, as a whole community; if we let political boundary lines defeat progressive action as a whole community, it will be because we lack imagination and resourcefulness.

In every community the worthwhile things that are done must come from local leadership. What needs to be done will never be done satis-

factorily from the outside. The leaders of city government in the United States have an unlimited opportunity. They have great responsibility. The presence of so many here today shows that they recognize it.

Improved Methods for Building Better Cities

HON. J. WOODALL RODGERS, Mayor, Dallas, Texas

WE ARE here today to consider improved methods for the building of better cities. This we call City Planning. It is not new.

Queen Semiramis of Babylon planned the first complete city on the banks of the Euphrates centuries ago. Paris, France furnished the first example of building a city as a whole. L'Enfant, the great French architect, planned our Nation's Capital in 1791, to accommodate two million people, with remarkable foresight and skill. Daniel H. Burnham, a half century ago, achieved outstanding recognition in the masterful planning of the Chicago Columbian Exposition.

In the last quarter of a century, every modern city in America has felt the imperative need of good city planning, recognized its development as a scientific and useful art, and accepted the work of the City Plan Engineer as that of a great and noble profession.

And what is "City Planning?" City Planning is simply the exercise of municipal imagination. It is the scientific and expert vision of inevitable city growth—and the preparation of plans to provide for that growth. It is municipal pre-vision, preparedness, and prevention.

And what is the "Purpose of Planning?" The Purpose of Planning is to correct the mistakes of the past and prevent the mistakes of the future; to allot and arrange the use of the land, the people thereon, and the facilities which serve them in a manner most acceptable, convenient and useful to the general welfare of the entire community.

Why do we plan? Because we want to have a good city.

What makes a good city? A good city is:

First. A city in which all the great scientific and technical advances of our civilization, (advances in everything from building construction to mosquito control), are used to the fullest extent for the benefit of every citizen.

Second. A city that is well arranged upon its site, with its residential, commercial and industrial areas, and its transportation channels, all harmoniously inter-related.

Third. A city in which business and industry can be conducted expeditiously, pleasantly and profitably.

Fourth. A city with good residential neighborhoods for everyone—neighborhoods that are designed for the raising of fine citizens; neighborhoods that are spacious, attractive, private, safe and stable; neighborhoods with plenty of park area and large school grounds.

Fifth. A city so efficiently disposed that the essential municipal services can be provided at a minimum tax cost.

Why do our cities need new plans?

First. Because they were not planned *as cities* at the start. They were just so many real estate subdivisions tacked onto each other in a topsy-turvey fashion. Like the ragged, tattered, home-spun breeches of a country boy, real estate developers have slapped on one patch after another, until it's time for some new, "store-bought" clothes to make the subject presentable in the polite society of the family of modern American cities.

Narrow streets, built for horse-and-buggy days, cannot accommodate the automobile age. Wagon yards are no good for helicopter stations. Overgrown country towns are groaning under the burdensome weight of modern cities. Cities geared to an Eighteenth or Nineteenth Century chassis cannot carry the Twentieth Century load. Heavy population trends to the great urban centers have overrun the framework of our cities built without plans to accommodate them, pyramiding the pressing problems to be solved. A legacy of square mile after square mile of developed city, functionally and structurally obsolete, was bequeathed to us.

Second. Our cities need new plans, because heretofore we have run away from these problems. The automobile, with quick access to the suburbs, seemed to offer an easy escape. But rather than a solution, this was an ever-increasing aggravation of this unfortunate situation.

Sleeping cities, as they are sometimes called, grew up all around the mother city. This impaired the tax base of the parent city and brought the cancerous growth of blight and slum to its social and economic life. It bred disunity in a divided citizenship. It disfranchised many of our leading citizens from a voice in their government, and shot the insidious poison of class-consciousness and divided responsibility into the civic life and spirit of every American city, to siphon off the very life-blood and gnaw at the very vitals of our democratic institutions and the American way of life.

Third. Our cities have been built by minorities. Too often, well-organized and vehement pressure groups, seeking special privileges, have made political footballs out of the cities' policies and plans, contrary to the welfare of the community as a whole.

What is the answer? How can we build a good city?

The first step should be the preparation of a comprehensive, realistic and up-to-date Master City Plan, embracing the entire metropolitan urban area of the city, based upon a careful analysis of the city structure and its needs, under the supervision of the best available talent and skill.

The second step is to insure that all improvements, both public and private, will in the future, follow this general chart, once it is made.

The third step is to bring public thought, participation and support along in its making, to guarantee its execution.

Three basic considerations should be the foundation of this Plan.

First. The estimated future population of the whole metropolitan community for a quarter of a century ahead.

Second. The pattern of arranging this population on the land.

Third. The pattern of arranging the proper use and allotment of the land and the facilities which serve the people thereon.

Engineering skill with the wisdom of the ages has discovered certain natural and fundamental laws which govern and control normal actions of men in building cities which serve as the lamp of experience by which their feet are guided. Timely observance of these laws will help us develop modern cities to meet modern needs. Proper allotment of real property to its various functional purposes, and protection of its value and use by adequate zoning are imperative in modern-day planning. The component parts of the city are arranged in an orderly manner and coördinated to a complete and useful pattern, good to look upon, and desirable to work and live within. Residential areas, with schools, parks and open spaces, should be properly provided, and placed for commerce and industry, so that each may have its maximum development without interference with others.

We turn now to the major physical facilities to serve our future city. These are five in number.

First. Our Major Street System. Our Street System must give access to our commercial and industrial areas and furnish convenient connections between our various residential neighborhoods. We must concentrate on easy traffic circulation within our city, on parking areas (municipal, if you please), and other necessary measures to relieve downtown congestion. Basic in this plan will be the national (or interregional) highway system and our state highway system, which include our busiest and most congested thoroughfares and present our most pressing problems.

Second. Transportation, Rail, Water, and Air. Unnecessary railroads should be abandoned and removed from our city limits. Dangerous grade crossings should be eliminated. Railroads and rail facilities should operate from belt lines around the city where possible. Freight depots, loading and unloading stations, should be grouped and concentrated in wholesale manufacturing and industrial districts. They should not be permitted to distort and disturb our residential communities, bring death traps and dangerous traffic hazards daily to these congested districts, or demoralize real estate values all along their lines, leaving blight and slum in their wake. Good city planning is hopelessly paralyzed without public-spirited and intelligent coöperation of the railroads. Contrary to general belief, the railroads have shown a very fine spirit in many instances. We have three good examples in my own city of Dallas, Texas.

The Texas & Pacific Railroad removed its tracks from Pacific Avenue for fifteen blocks and turned the dirtiest and ugliest back alley along the

tracks into one of our finest paved streets through the heart of our city. It virtually "lifted the face" of the entire city.

We now have under contract with the Texas State Highway Department and the (H. & T. C.) Southern Pacific Railroad the removal of tracks from the northern to the southern boundary of our city limits, ten miles long, and the building of a great boulevard through the heart of our city. All our railroads have coöperated in the use of one union passenger terminal. We know and have felt the very finest coöperation of the railroads in the building of a better city. We realize their schedules must be maintained and their service must not be impaired and the interests of their investors and stockholders must be protected. With these factors in mind, we have had no difficulty in finding a common ground of mutual interest and coöperation.

Water. Every city will solve its own peculiar water problem by approved formulae not necessarily new. If we can harness the deadly lightning to our simplest needs, certainly exercising dominion over the gentle rain that falls from heaven should not be a difficult task.

Air. Aviation is the fascinating miracle of the age. It thrills imaginative youth and challenges American leadership today. It is the Princess of the god of Fortune, and her favor will determine the destiny of future trade centers of the world, and the trend of civilization for generations to come. Passengers, freight, express and mail will fly the wings of the air, and trade centers of the world will shift and change with the whir of wings. The fruits of aviation will go to those who woo it, and grass will grow in the streets of the cities which know not its favor nor its rich embrace.

In Dallas, our Master Plan of Aviation calls for twenty-one ports, four to be owned by the city to set a Master Pattern, and give *functional* use to military passengers, freight, express, mail and private flying, as, if and when needed. Every progressive American city will now lay out its Master Aviation Pattern to serve in the years to come.

Super ports, major ports, minor ports, helicopter stations (there is no magic in these names, call them what you will), must meet current and anticipated needs, through municipal ownership or private enterprise, as in each case may seem best. But the direct responsibility for the Master Pattern falls upon the cities and their elected public officials who have already subsidized and supported aviation for a quarter of a century with taxpayers' money. They cannot now fail to see that an adequate Master Plan of Aviation is made for their community, and necessary safeguards, legal and financial, thrown around it to guarantee its orderly arrangement and insure its maximum development and usefulness.

Certainly lend-lease investments should give us free access to the ports of the world. Universal war has made the entire world a scientific laboratory for every form of aviation, and a proving ground for every use. Victory alone awaits its change from military to commercial.

History will bless those who envision it; it will curse those who fail to embrace it. No city can meet modern needs without a sound, progressive Master Plan of Aviation.

Third. Local Transit (*Streetcars and Buses*). The streetcar and bus systems are imperative to our economic life, but the day of the loud, grinding streetcar on iron rails is gone. The noiseless streetcar on composition rails, the trolley-buses and motor-buses, with improved and noiseless service, are the order of the day. Few people can afford to live far from transit service. The transit plan should be properly coördinated with the studies of population disbursement and land-use allotment.

Fourth. Parks and Public Schools. Parks and public schools not only provide for educational and recreational needs, the importance of which is universally recognized, but should also become the focal point of much of our community life. Our Master City Plan will provide for neighborhood parks and ample school grounds and recreational facilities for all our residential areas, as well as parkways and larger parks on the outskirts of our city. It will plan a greater community use for school and recreational facilities, and in some instances include regional or neighborhood libraries in school buildings.

Fifth. Public Buildings. Public buildings should be adequate to meet the needs of the community and should reflect the character, tone and quality of the people whom they serve. Public buildings, as a rule, depress business and business values, though fortunately, they complement each other, and many cities, such as Saint Louis, Cleveland, Denver Kansas City, and others, have found it desirable to bring many such buildings together around attractive landscaping to form a "Civic Center," to become one of the show places of the city. Such a Civic Center doubly serves when it also reclaims a blight or slum area.

Then, too, the Plan is only a blueprint to chart our way. We must follow through once it is prepared. Public interest, understanding and support must be obtained, so that once made it can be carried out, else it is of no avail. Its mere preparation solves nothing. It must have such public support and endorsement that will not permit it to be cast aside. Only the executed part will be of any value.

The city's administrative policies and practices will be studied, and the adopted plan will be in accordance with sound, legal procedure, to give it official status and meaning, to prevent its being ignored or overridden, and assure its general accomplishment. City ordinances, including zoning, and the control of new land subdivision, within and without the city limits, must be harmonized with the Master Plan and its objectives. A capital expenditure program, definitely scheduling the improvements under the Master Plan, and amortizing their costs in a long-range program, must be set up in keeping with the city's fiscal operations and ability to pay. Through such process, I believe a good city can be built under our democracy, provided and provided only, that

wide public knowledge, understanding and support of the Master Plan and the measures necessary for its realization accompany it.

All possible steps should be taken to encourage public participation in its making, to insure public demand and support for its ultimate realization. Indeed, it is a gradual process. We who live in cities pay but little attention to the small changes that take place from day to day. Even over a period of a year, they do not seem to amount to much. However, their sum total over a decade results in startling change. If we could return after an absence of a century, we would be amazed at the transformation we would see. Taking the long view, our cities are not static; they are quite flexible. We can make them what we wish, regardless of what they may now be. It is up to us. We can go along as we have, allowing each change to fall pretty much where it pleases, and as it pleases, regardless of the consequences, and eventually or inevitably end with chaos; or we can guide and control each change as it comes, harmonize it with the Master Plan, and, in the end, with the expenditure of less money, find that we have built a good city.

And what may be said to be the most pressing and immediate postwar problems?

First. Employment for ten million soldiers and fifty million war workers. Failure to meet this challenge would be treason and endanger the principle of free enterprise, our capitalistic system, our democratic form of local self-government, and our American institutions.

Second. Reconstructing obsolete areas and rebuilding blighted areas, where appropriate, with moderately-priced, single-family residences and apartments, arranged on a community basis. And what can a city do to help in this respect? It can pass legislation giving the right of condemnation in such slum and run-down areas. It can probably offer a five or ten percent indirect subsidy to private enterprise in the following ways:

It can remit and readjust tax valuations for assessment to attract and justify private investment, on a limited-return basis. It can buy rights-of-way, pave streets, install storm and sanitary sewers, provide schools and parks on a community basis, and make the neighborhood an attractive, comfortable, and desirable place in which to live.

Cities must be rebuilt from the heart out, or they stand forever and eternally doomed to economic death. Time runs late on us all.

Third. The unification of all component parts of the metropolitan urban area, either by merger with the mother city, or some form of metropolitan government to equalize the civic and political responsibility of all citizens. In the rapid and abnormal expansion of the urban area, we have wholly ignored the general welfare of the community as a whole, and of our parent city which has nourished, mothered and protected us all. Many of our well-to-do citizens, civic leaders and top-flight executives, live in suburban communities around our borders, with an imaginary line drawn about them, isolating themselves from political and

civic responsibility of the mother city, which gave them their opportunity, their substance and protection of their jobs, their investments and their wealth, and to whom they owe their responsibility of citizenship, their fealty and their support, if modern cities are to survive under our democracy, and if local self-government shall not perish from the earth. Blood pumped from the heart must return to renourish the body, if life shall last.

With a few selected governmental functions already adequately provided for by the mother city, these suburban citizens draw their robes of smug complacency around them, unnecessarily duplicate the cost of government and governmental functions, turn their backs on duties of society and their obligations of citizenship to help carry the load of the substance which they enjoy, of charity and relief to the unfortunates which is theirs, and the cost of public improvements and facilities of the mother city, which they, with all other citizens, enjoy.

Millions are spent for aviation, downtown streets, parks and boulevards, civic centers, museums of art, natural history, zoos, stadiums, auditoriums, public libraries, public welfare, charity hospitals, and all other governmental facilities and protections, which they enjoy daily and as fully as those who remain within the city's technical borders, though they share not the responsibility of administering them, nor the cost of their enjoyment.

High-class residential communities themselves cost less, low-class more, and their equalizing influence is essential to a sound economy. Governmental cost and protection of a place to work or engage in business for profit exceeds many times that of a place for a home alone. The penalty or subsidy paid by the mother city for crime, charity, slums, and other forms of economic relief and community enterprise, is a definite part of the cost of opportunity of the non-resident commuter for livelihood or profit, and should therefore be borne with proportionate equality with those who enjoy it.

Investments are made for profit alone. Taxes are paid for governmental services rendered, and for value received, and not as philanthropic gestures for patriotic purposes.

A man's home town is the place in which he lives and makes his living. The two are one and inseparable. They cannot any more be separated than the component parts of the human body.

Blighted and obsolete areas are on *economic relief* and should be borne by all. Cheap fire insurance rates of expensive fireproof homes segregated from the mother city, are at the expense of correspondingly high rates on the incity dwellings which are entitled to their leveling influence for normalcy. Slums and outcasts of property and people are the burdens of the entire community of which they are a component part. Disease and despair, crime and misfortune, poverty and pestilence, know no boundary lines in a metropolitan community, but are the

burden of us all. Economic and political unity alone can save the cities from rot and decay. Cancerous germs of blight must be removed from the heart and the vigorous blood of new growth pumped in.

Whether we know it or not, the wealthier class of society in suburban cities imposes upon the less wealthy class of the mother city the greater costs of government. Charity flows the wrong way, and should be corrected. Government was never intended to protect citizens only as they slept—sleeping cities and sleeping citizens should awake, and daylight citizens should be loyal and faithful through sunshine and shower all around the clock. Segregation breeds class consciousness and disunity and endangers our democratic form of government. Duplication of governmental services and costs should be eliminated. Unity of spirit, thought and action should be encouraged and inspired if we are to survive the shocks and burdens of the postwar period. The best men in our communities should take leading parts in our community life, sit on our councils, park boards, and planning commissions. We need them, and they need us, if local self-government is to survive. The government must join the sacred triune of the church, the home and the school, if we are to achieve our ultimate and maximum destiny.

The fact that our democracy has never produced a satisfactory, well-rounded city is no sign it cannot. With fifty-six percent of our people living in cities, we must make it work, if democracy is to survive.

We must plan now. Time grows short. Good planning takes time. Surveys and blueprints, plans and specifications, must be made. Financial programs must be worked out to support them. The public must be informed and educated to support bond issues and improvements, and we must have work ready for millions of soldiers and war workers when they return from war to peace. Despair and hunger are breeding grounds for communism, anarchy and revolution. The postwar period will present the world's greatest unemployment load. It must be met, though it is a colossal task. It is a part of the cost of the war, and the only tax structure that will support it is that of the Federal Government. It is our greatest tax-gatherer, bringing to its coffers seventy-five percent of every tax dollar. Whether we like it or not, we have no other place to turn. Highways of land and air are national in character and use, and why should not Federal funds bear their rightful part of the enormous cost? The new policy of the Public Roads Administration opens up, widens and paves national highways through cities, offers one of the greatest opportunities for city building in the postwar period.

When Pearl Harbor broke, city building stopped. At war's end, our cities must be brought up to date. Critical materials for construction, paving and maintenance, went into the crucibles of war. We must catch up. Bottlenecks, traffic hazards, parking problems, ever increasing, must be solved. Public building, private construction, and homes, long deferred improvements, will be due. Obsolete buildings must be modern-

ized to meet modern needs. Added growth during the war period must be provided for. Great days and great problems lie ahead, but likewise, great opportunities and responsibility. We face new conditions and new challenges. It is our duty to vision and to plan far ahead to meet them. We must have worthwhile work waiting for our returning soldiers and war workers. It must be built on sound economy. We must push forward! To do this, we must have plans. Already we should be in the designing stage. We are the trustees of this great responsibility. Let not history record that our eyes were too dim to see the vision, or our hands too feeble to carry it out.

Daniel H. Burnham, the great Chicago architect and planner, said:

> Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood, and probably themselves will not be realized. Make big plans; aim high in hope and work, remembering that a noble, logical diagram, once recorded, will never die, but long after we are gone, will be a living thing asserting itself with ever-growing insistence. Remember that our sons and grandsons are going to do things that would stagger us. Let your watchword be order, and your beacon beauty.

Metropolitan Cities in the Postwar Period

MALCOLM H. DILL, Executive Secretary Citizens Planning Association for the Development of the Cincinnati Area, Cincinnati, Ohio
(Mr. Dill has since become Chief, Planning and Design Section, City Planning Commission)

AT THIS moment the big push toward victory is naturally uppermost in everyone's mind. We are here, however, because we realize that there must be no neglecting to prepare for the different type of emergency that will face us when war ends. Preparation for winning the war has involved planning problems of an acute nature. There will also be acute postwar problems, such as reconversion by industry to production for civilian needs, and readjustment of employment to the same end.

These statements are elementary. They are not news to any of you. It seems necessary to make them, however, in order to differentiate between these war and postwar planning problems that are *acute*, and arise out of an extraordinary emergency, and those that are *chronic*. Organized private industry is seeking solutions to the problems of reconverting factories and of achieving full-scale employment. There seems to be general agreement that industry may not be able to absorb the entire re-employment quota of veterans and civilians, and that therefore it will be necessary to provide useful jobs to some extent through programs of public works projects. In many communities it is possible that at least in part, such activities aimed toward solving the acute problem of employment may also help to solve some of the chronic planning problems. It may be well to emphasize that this is more likely to result in permanent assets for the community if the programming of postwar

public works projects has been done in accordance with a city or regional master plan than if it is merely the result of compiling unrelated lists of suggested improvements that have been taken down off the shelves, and dusted. The latter technique has prevailed hitherto in all too many localities.

What are some of these chronic planning problems to which reference has been made, and with which most of our cities will be faced even after we may have achieved full employment in postwar industrial production for civilian needs? Without attempting a complete inventory, a few can be cited which are typical of practically all American cities of considerable size:

1. *Migration from the Central City:* Movement outward toward the suburban fringe, or still farther out to the surrounding countryside, is too common a phenomenon to require detailed description. Made possible primarily by the private automobile, this trend may become even further aggravated by perfection and mass production of a foolproof family airplane. This gradual exodus from the inner city is a natural enough trend; a consequence of the sins of omission and commission of our unplanned, inconvenient communities. It is natural, but it has a debilitating effect on the city. This drain will be further accelerated by the levelling off of population curves that apparently is to be expected within the next generation. There is an obvious relationship between such urban emigration and the second chronic planning problem:

2. *The Downward Spiral of Real Estate Values, and Upward Spiral of Taxes:* Emigration from the city means decreased demand for properties, —hence lower values, a lower tax base, and eventually higher taxes to meet continuing demands for services, retirement of bonds, etc.

3. *Obsolete, Blighted Areas:* If the downward spiral of real estate values has descended to the point where, over a considerable area and period of time, income is less than outgo, that area is probably blighted. The only remedy is tearing down and replanning and redeveloping from the ground up, in accordance with carefully prepared land-use plans. This, of course, cannot be done as casually as it is proposed. A real challenge to American ingenuity, this problem offers significant possibilities not only for re-employment, but also for helping to resuscitate the construction industry if effective techniques of procedure on a large scale can only be worked out in time.

4. *Needed Residential Construction:* Acute as well as chronic is the postwar shortage of adequate dwelling units that is faced by many cities. Undoubtedly a lot of construction is to be expected. Shall it be just a builders' picnic with helter-skelter spotting of houses wherever the picking looks good? Or shall there be some rhyme and reason to our building, bearing in mind that the subdivider's blueprint of streets and blocks of today becomes a permanent asset or liability of tomorrow's community? And also remembering that each new subdivision tends to

lessen the likelihood of utilizing other uncompleted, existing plats, and to place a further drain and strain on the older but still useful residential areas.

5. *Transportation Snarls:* Sometimes these result from mutual interference between private cars and mass transit vehicles on inadequate highways. Sometimes only private cars or trucks are involved. Railroads may complicate the picture through grade crossings and badly placed terminals. Lack of adequate provision for off-street parking is almost universal. At any rate we can agree that at times and in places, traffic congestion has reached an almost intolerable stage in many cities.

6. *Lack of Adequate Recreational Areas, Facilities, and Programs of Activities:* In many cities this lack is particularly striking in the oldest portions, but there is also cause for concern about the usual failure to make provision for playgrounds and playfields in unincorporated areas where the greatest population increases tend to occur. Too often in such localities the lack of a governmental body with broad legislative powers, comparable to a city or village council in a municipality, results in everybody's business being nobody's concern. This is particularly true of playground areas, the need for which is often not felt to be serious in a suburban community until the latter has been built up to the point where open spaces are no longer available.

7. *Lack of Adequate Health and Educational Facilities:* Too many of our cities have inadequate or obsolete hospitals, health centers, branch libraries, and school plants. The draining of population from a central city tends to create a need for new schools in its suburban fringe. At the same time it may make questionable the replacement of obsolescent buildings by new ones on the same sites, in older areas where population is dwindling.

8. *Pollution of Rivers and Lakes:* Most of our larger cities abut on bodies of water. How many of these are sufficiently free from pollution by sewage and industrial wastes so that they may be widely used for all kinds of recreation? How many cities, like Cincinnati, even depend on highly polluted rivers and streams for their public water supply?

So much for some of the more nearly universal planning problems. The statements that have been made about chronic ailments are true of many cities whether or not metropolitan areas are involved. This talk was supposed to be about the latter. Well, doesn't a metropolitan city have the same ailments as others, but with additional complications? A metropolitan city might be thought of as a single terrestrial body that by a slow-motion process has "exploded" into a terrestrial solar system. The number of satellites undoubtedly adds to the complexity of planning and development problems. For example: The City of Cincinnati, with a 1940 population of 456,000 and an area of 73 square miles, involves only two separate official authorities—City Council and the Board of Education. Hamilton County, excluding Cincinnati, contains a popula-

tion of a little over one-third of that of the City, and an area about three and one-half times as large, but it comprises 91 separate taxing authorities including 49 school districts, 29 cities and villages, the trustees of 12 townships, the Board of County Commissioners, and the County Park Board.

What are we going to do about all these metropolitan planning problems? Whose responsibility are they? There has been devised a type of official public agency which we call a planning commission. Some of these, as now existing, have narrow scopes of activity, and make very small dents in their communities. It is probably safe to say that no planning commission in the country possesses the prestige that it might and should have. Of course, not all of them deserve prestige. Any commission, to be effective over a period of time, must have adequate funds and a full-time technical staff. The functions of planning commissions and staffs vary in different communities, but in general, theirs is the responsibility for assembling necessary data and preparing a master plan to serve as a general guide for the manifold activities and developments.

In a metropolitan area, where there are numerous independent administrative agencies, it is all the more important that there be one agency which can *plan* comprehensively, and not have to stop short at the boundary of a political subdivision, saying "This is where I get off." A single planning agency for a metropolitan area seems logical, but so far there are few if any such *official* agencies. We find rare examples of joint city-county commissions or staffs in Louisville, Toledo, and Nashville, for example. Enabling legislation is probably lacking in most States to grant comprehensive authority to a single agency. But in fact *authority* is not essential for most planning purposes. In Cincinnati, where Council has made an appropriation of $100,000 for the first year toward preparation of a revised Master Plan, the City Planning Commission is proposing to form a group of Regional Planning Associates, to represent not only Hamilton County and its municipalities, but also cities and counties across the River in Kentucky that are an integral part of the Metropolitan City. These representatives would sit at meetings pertaining to the Master Plan studies, and would have equal voice and vote with members of the Planning Commission, except where matters of actual legal jurisdiction are concerned. Here is a case of representation without taxation —for Cincinnati is paying the bill.

In the long run, however, a planning commission can really go to town only if there is in the background, and not too far in the background, a large group of citizens who understand community planning problems and are determined that something effective shall be done about them. And so we come to what is certainly the $128 question: How can we get people to take a continuing active interest in the planning problems of their city? At the risk of poaching in the preserve of this afternoon's session, I want to make a few comments on this point.

During the past few years the people of our Nation have proved again their ability to meet a crisis with sustained unanimity of purpose and action. Our industries have achieved undreamed-of feats of production. Our citizens have loyally given of their time, services and blood to Civilian Defense, War Bond Drives, the Red Cross, and other causes. With peace, however, will come relaxation from the rigors and disciplines of wartime. Relax we must, of course, at least with a long seventh-inning stretch. But must we lose the sense of obligation toward public service that is one of the fine by-products of war? Can we *afford* to relapse into indifference to the problems of peace-time, problems less compelling and stimulating, but more complicated and really more difficult of solution, than those we have of late been facing and solving? The spirit and ability that have characterized production and civilian activities must be turned toward improving techniques of governing ourselves, and improving our environment. Our metropolitan cities are facing a stabilized population. That means orienting our thinking not in terms of bigger cities, but better ones.

Let's not approach this thing in any attitude of crusading or altruism or philanthropy, but as a matter of enlightened self-interest. Sheer altruism may weary of well-doing, but enlightened self-interest is more likely to carry on to a successful finish. The planning problems I've mentioned are of concern not merely to a planning commission, or to just a few persons with large investments in real estate. These things directly or indirectly affect every Tom, Dick, and Harry in every sizable community. Whether he's a renter or an owner, they affect his living conditions at home, his job, the value of his property, and most important, the kind of neighborhood and general environment that his children and grandchildren will grow up in.

The postwar job of gradually revitalizing our cities calls for courage, imagination, persistence, and organization. Organization, I believe, requires a permanent paid staff. But do not think that after having formed a Citizens Council or Association and having set up a capable staff, you are entitled to feel that your troubles and efforts are over. In a democracy the responsibilities of citizenship cannot be delegated.

Solomon said in The Book of Proverbs, "Where there is no vision, the people perish." He might have added to that, "and when there is no action taken to translate that vision into tangible results, the people don't do so well, either."

May I close by telling you the story of Elmer, the strong man? In the hills of Kentucky there was once a man named Elmer, who had such great strength that his fame spread as far as New York. Sensing a good human-interest story, a newspaper sent a reporter out to Kentucky to interview Elmer. He got off at a little backwoods station, and on inquiring for Elmer was told to walk up the road about a mile or two. The reporter had walked some distance when he came to a blacksmith shop,

where a husky fellow was just in the act of bending a cold horseshoe with his bare hands. "Ah," thought the reporter, "this must be Elmer." But no, Elmer lived up the road about a mile farther. By and by the traveler came to a turn in the road, where young giant was plowing. He had no horse, but was just pushing the plow with his bare hands. "Is your name Elmer?" said the reporter. "No sir," replied the farmer, "he lives up at the next bend in the road." So the wayfarer plodded on, and sure enough, a few minutes later he came upon the biggest man he had ever seen. "You *must* be Elmer, the strong man," gasped the reporter.

"Yup!"

"Are you as strong as they say you are?"

"Stranger, I shore am." Thereupon Elmer grabbed himself by the seat of his pants, and lifted himself right up off the ground.

And that, ladies and gentlemen, is just what our metropolitan cities must do in the postwar period!

A Modern City's Transportation Needs

CHARLES GORDON, Managing Director, American Transit Association, New York City

MANY people are beginning to realize that something is radically wrong with our cities; that the situation has been getting steadily worse for a considerable time; and that unless steps are taken at once to reverse, in the immediate postwar period when building is resumed, the trends which had been gaining momentum for a number of years before the outbreak of war, our American cities will be destroyed from within just as effectively—if not so spectacularly—as bombing is destroying the cities of Europe and Asia.

Cities all over America are figuratively exploding. They are spreading out in random fashion with no apparent plan of control, over much larger areas than seems necessary or rational. While much vacant land lies totally undeveloped within city boundaries, a widening belt of built-up property, radiating from the business centers has been deteriorating into blighted districts.

Harland Bartholomew has furnished a key to the problem by pointing out that the three major stages in the growth of American cities are closely linked with the development of local transportation facilities.

Before 1880 the area of cities was limited by the distances which could be traversed in a reasonable time between home and work or business, on foot, on horseback or in animal-drawn vehicles. In this period, cities were limited to an area extending two or two and a half miles from the center.

Between 1880 and 1910, the second stage, introduction of the electric street car extended the practicable radius of population distribution, and hence of potential urban development, to a distance of approxi-

mately five miles. Simultaneously, during this period, industrialization and a great influx of immigration caused cities to grow rapidly in both population and size. This magic combination of population increase and improved transportation, set up centrifugal and centripetal forces which were far reaching in their effects. Property values at the centers of cities rose rapidly, and the business area spread to accommodate a growing trade area. People moved farther out as transportation was improved, and the sites of old homes, thus abandoned, were converted to business use with profit to the owner. There were slums in cities, but the term "blighted areas" was not widely used. There was also congestion in this period, but the term referred primarily to high population densities within limited areas, rather than to street congestion as it so generally does today.

Cities grew so rapidly over so long a period of time, that the idea became firmly established that the resulting rise in city property values would continue indefinitely.

Thus when a new and radical product of our industrial age appeared, which was to have a most profound effect upon the whole pattern of urban living, its significance was scarcely noted and its full influence is not yet generally recognized—even after some thirty years. This was the automobile.

Its rapid development soon revolutionized all former concepts of transportation limits and acceptable standards. The potential area of urbanization jumped from its former five-mile radius to fifteen or twenty miles. It needs but a knowledge of the fact that the area of a circle is proportional to the square of its radius, to grasp the significance of this change, in relation to the stability of urban property.

The potential area of cities increased during a short period, from approximately 75 square miles to about 700 square miles, or almost 1000 percent. And at about the same time, the curve of population increase in cities was flattening out; in fact, just prior to the outbreak of war it had actually reversed itself in some locations, resulting in a net loss of urban population. Thus, while on the one hand the potential area of urbanization was multiplied by ten, the flow of population into cities slackened, and in some cases actually reversed.

It was quite natural, that as automobiles were perfected and reduced in price, a steady drift of people set in from older residential areas into a wide belt of surrounding undeveloped and relatively low-cost land which was now accessible for home sites. So, the decentralizing process started. At the same time, rapidly spreading ownership and increased use of automobiles, filled to capacity the whole street system of the old community.

To remedy intolerable traffic conditions, and to eliminate bottlenecks, many street widening projects were undertaken. These and other streets were designated as main traffic arteries. Traffic signal systems were introduced, and other measures adopted in a losing struggle to permit the

inherent advantages of the speed, flexibility and comfort of the automobile to be utilized. In a desperate effort to meet the situation, we cut ruthlessly through the hearts of former quiet residential areas, without realizing the consequences to environment and living conditions.

Generally, we made a horrible mess of the whole situation. If there is any doubt about it, stand and reflect for a moment, while watching a group of children threading their way through modern city traffic on their way to school. It is easy to understand why mothers and fathers of young children grasp the first opportunity of a home in the suburbs, where they hope they may escape the hazards of city traffic to their children, and its noise and other nuisances to themselves. They are merely running away from the mistakes which have been made in dealing with the problems brought about by the widespread use of automobiles. What they seek is rather simple—a quiet and safe environment in which to live and to raise a family.

Unfortunately, without proper planning and control of development, decentralization does not assure desirable environment even in the outskirts. Many developments on the edges of cities lack proper fire and police protection—to say nothing of schools and the opportunity for healthy social and civic contact. There are slums of jerry-built houses and shacks on the outskirts of cities just as there are of tenements and abandoned homes near their centers.

Decentralization does not afford a remedy for the ills of modern cities. On the contrary, when brought about, as it has been, by an effort to run away from past mistakes, instead of remedying them, decentralization merely spreads the diseases of congestion, instability and blight, and ultimately multiplies the seriousness of the difficulty by increasing the area affected. Not only within our cities, but in their environs as well, it is apparent that every home owner and every investor in a business or in business property stands in imminent danger from the instability and huge economic waste resulting from unpredictable shifts in property values. Decentralization involves greatly increased costs for city services, and reduces the efficiency of the entire community in providing convenient and economical physical access. Those who run away from the city as a place to live, hope that others will support the cost of maintaining it as a place to work, and as a center of culture and amusement.

There are, of course, other factors than traffic congestion involved in this migration from older city areas. Buildings and old neighborhoods become obsolete and run down. Redevelopment of such inlying property is made difficult because owners continue to value it at high levels, or merely hang on in the hope that some shift in the trend of development, or the influence of a new public improvement may justify their expectations. This leaves no alternative to builders, but to locate in the outskirts, residential developments intended to appeal to young families seeking home ownership at a price they can afford to pay.

But the fact remains that the way in which we deal with our local transportation problem in the next few years will have a much more fundamental effect upon the pattern of our future cities than has been generally recognized. And, though I do not profess to be an authority on the whole field of community planning I have yet to find any aspect of the problem which a sound community transportation policy, combined with modified local tax policies and adequate community planning, zoning and subdivision control laws, would not go a long way toward solving.

Modern city planners visualize a business district of limited extent, surrounded by a group of more or less self-contained satellite neighborhoods or communities, each having its own local schools, churches and shopping sections, and separated by liberal areas of open space to provide facilities for recreation, arteries for transportation, and protection against encroachment.

There is great hope in the growth of this concept of modern city development. Note that there is ample area available to house the population of even the largest city, at moderate standards of density and at reasonable distances for ready accessibility to the heart of the area. But by no stretch of the imagination are there enough space or enough resources to provide the facilities needed if the planning is to be done on the assumption that everyone will move about in private vehicles.

If in the replanning of tomorrow's cities, disintegration of present areas is to be checked and the spread of blight at a faster rate than ever, immediately the present restrictions on building are removed, is to be prevented, this local transportation problem must be more thoroughly and widely understood than at present. For a major purpose of the very existence of cities is to provide the opportunity for convenient personal contact for business, social and cultural purposes. Because of this, accessibility is a major factor in determining the value of any given piece of urban property. That location in a city is most valuable which is most accessible to the greatest number of people.

Accordingly, it is futile to attempt to build a beautiful city, if the arteries of local travel are so choked that the major purposes of the existence of the city are defeated. Better housing, more adequate parks and playgrounds and the many other necessary social and esthetic features of a modern city, can achieve their purpose only if there is also available an adequate circulatory system, to promote orderly development and use of commercial and residential areas in their most advantageous relationship. External beauty can follow only as a natural consequence of functional and economic well-being—for then only is a community financially able to support the amenities.

There is little difficulty in enlisting recognition of the need for fast, convenient and safe local transportation as such. The need is obvious. But there is far too much tendency to focus attention exclusively on

facilities for automobile travel while overlooking the importance of making provision for the improvement of public transit facilities by buses, trolley coaches, street cars or rapid transit lines. Plans for major urban highway projects should not be settled without taking into full consideration the opportunity of designing these structures so as to make them as useful as possible to those who ride in public vehicles. Unless this is done, new urban highways will fail to accomplish the purposes for which they are intended, and there is danger that they will merely expedite the process of urban disintegration.

The war has demonstrated the importance of the function which is performed by the buses, trolley coaches, street cars and rapid transit lines in American cities. Despite the great curtailment in the use of automobiles resulting from the cessation of construction, and the necessity of conserving gasoline, tires and parts, the existing public carriers—unable to obtain new vehicles except to a very limited extent—have nevertheless been able to step into the breach and meet the emergency.

Public vehicles are of course crowded and in some instances uncomfortably so. But it is worthy of note that with little increased equipment they are this year carrying a traffic load double that of the depression year 1933. These carriers during 1943 transported a total of 22 billion riders. This is more than the equivalent of transporting every man, woman and child of every town of 25,000 population and above once every day of the year.

Visualize then the problem before us, if we attempt to provide facilities in cities, so that this local travel may ultimately all move in individual vehicles. It will help in understanding this situation if I give you just a few figures.

At the normal standard of loading of automobiles in city traffic in the United States—which is quite uniform for all cities throughout the country—the maximum number of people that can be carried by a lane of automobiles operating on the most modern type of grade separated, super-highway, is about 2600 people per hour past any given point. In comparison, a lane of buses operating on an ordinary city street, subject to crossing interference, has a capacity at moderate standards of loading, of about 9000 passengers per hour. A lane of street cars under the same conditions raises the figure to about 13,500 people per hour, and the same cars in a subway, or other right-of-way where they are free from cross-traffic interference, will transport 20,000 people per hour. A single track of multiple car, rapid transit trains, operating in local service, has a capacity of 40,000 passengers per hour; and when the trains are run express, as in the subways of New York, they can transport about 60,000 passengers per hour at much lower standards of loading than have been prevalent there for many years.

Here then is a direct comparison. A lane of buses on an ordinary city street has a passenger capacity about 3½ times that of a lane of automobiles on an express highway. The capacity of a lane of street cars on a city street is about five times that of a lane of automobiles on an express highway. If the buses are put on one lane of the express highway, and properly designed turnouts for stopping provided, their capacity increases to five times that of a lane of autos on the same highway. If the street cars are put into a reserved strip on the express highway, their capacity becomes 7½ times that of a lane of autos on the same highway; and a single lane of express rapid transit trains raises the figure to more than twenty times the capacity of the lane of automobiles.

Even this does not tell the whole story. Automobiles in city areas present a storage problem. Study of the building cubage occupied by the workers in central area business buildings, and of the space required to store automobiles in the most modern types of ramp or elevator garages, indicates that it takes just about the same amount of space per person transported, to store automobiles, as it does per employee to conduct the business which is done in the central areas of modern cities. In other words, if all of the workers in the central area of the average city were to ride to work in automobiles, it would require as much cubage in building space to store their cars as is now occupied by the workers themselves. That is to say the building cubage required to carry on present business would need to be doubled. But please note that this takes care only of the cars of employees. It makes no provision for the storage of of the cars of those who come into these areas to do business—and that is the purpose for which the areas exist.

I hope that I have not given the impression, by what I have said, that I oppose the development of such major highway improvements as are needed in the environs and within modern cities, to eliminate traffic bottlenecks and to provide ready access to the countryside. Such parkways, waterway border drives and vehicular tunnels, as have been developed in and adjoining the metropolitan area of New York, for example, are a great civic asset and are necessary, in this motor age, to the well-being of the people of such a great metropolitan area. Similar facilities should be built by every major community to the extent that they can be paid for by the communities that are to benefit from them.

But the relatively minor functions which this whole elaborate system of express highways and parkways, in and around New York, plays in the maintenance of the rhythmic beat of the myriad activities constituting the economic and social life of that great metropolis, was strikingly demonstrated by a recent experience. When, during the emergency in gasoline supplies last summer, which affected the New York area, driving was radically curtailed and all pleasure use of automobiles prohibited, the number of automobiles on the streets of Manhattan was suddenly reduced to something less than one-half of what it had been. But the

additional load which was in consequence thrown on the public transit lines into and within Manhattan, was almost imperceptible.

It may be suggested that the public is not satisfied with the standards of comfort and convenience at present provided on urban public carriers. I have considerable sympathy with that view, and believe that much higher standards are desirable. Only then can public and private transportation stand in proper relation to each other in the public mind. Unfortunately, the policies of many cities in the past, in dealing with public transit problems, have had the effect of holding down the standard of service that could be provided at the levels of fares that the public is willing to pay.

It would be highly advantageous to modern cities to follow an opposite course, and to foster the improvement of public transit service in every possible way—even to subsidize it if necessary—to achieve the highest possible standard of convenience and comfort for public transit riders. Such a policy would be vastly more economical than to provide the highways for automobiles that are the only alternatives.

And so I say, there is danger in our planning for tomorrow's cities, of getting the cart before the horse; of providing the highways to give city dwellers access to the countryside before we provide the internal transportation systems essential to the very survival of the communities themselves. Unless this is recognized, we may find too late that we have merely expedited the process of destroying our cities as we know them today, and have distributed their populations helter skelter over the surrounding countryside. In such an eventuality, it is hard to visualize how any community can possibly carry the staggering tax burden, of providing over an area expanded ten-fold or more, the necessary municipal facilities and services of a modern urban community.

Perhaps much of this danger could be avoided, if there were closer coördination of effort between local transit officials, highway departments and community planning officials. Only recently has the interrelation of the activities of these three groups become fully apparent. Each can learn much from the other, to the great benefit of the community and the public. Close coördination and coöperation between them will do much to assure the adoption of sound policies for meeting a modern city's transportation needs.

Such policies must recognize that the purpose of all transportation planning in cities is to serve the interests of the people who live in these communities. The vehicles in which they ride are totally incidental. It is the movement of the people in the vehicles with which we are primarily concerned. Thus, the capacity, the utility and the social value of all transportation improvements in cities, must be measured—not in terms of vehicles—but in terms of the number of people that are served.

Coordination of Railroad Terminals

COL. FRANK G. JONAH, Chief Engineer, Frisco R. R., Saint Louis, Mo.

THE question of coördination or consolidation of railroad lines and terminals has been a subject of numerous studies, locally and nationally, for a great many years.

The Federal Government, through the Interstate Commerce Commission, had studies made as to economies that might result from the consolidation of various railway lines and had a study made by Professor Ripley, which was somewhat modified by the Interstate Commerce Commission and published August 3, 1921, providing for a consolidation of the railroads of the United States into 19 different systems. Later, the Interstate Commerce Commission, after further studies and hearings, published a report on December 9, 1929 proposing the consolidation of all the railroads of the United States into 21 systems, and it was believed that most of the economies that might be effected by consolidations would occur in the terminals, and in August 1933, during the depression, a study was made for the coördination of terminals in all the larger centers of railway operation in the country. This study was under the direction of the late Mr. Joseph Eastman, and final reports were published in 1935.

The Congressional authorizations for these studies provided that railway labor must not be displaced or thrown out of employment by the consolidation or abandonment of local terminals, and in the St. Louis area it was found that any resulting economies would be such that some parts of terminals would be abandoned, and it would be practically a reduction in railroad operating force of one thousand men. I presume the same situation was found to prevail elsewhere, so that there was no action taken on these reports other than a few minor suggestions where some consolidation was voluntarily made.

When these studies were made, nobody expected that there would be another world war going on in the early 1940s, and I think it is very fortunate that there was no curtailment or consolidation of railroad terminals made after these studies, because with the increased volume of business that the railroads have been forced to handle since 1940, it is obvious that they could not give the service they are rendering now with any less facilities than they have, and, indeed, it would be advisable if they had more facilities and equipment at this time.

The Association of American Railroads, in Washington, D. C., has been making a study of the transportation situation in this country, and in a bulletin issued in March last, this statement is made:

> In 1943, freight traffic on the railroads of the United States was nearly twice that of the peak year of the first World War in 1918, while passenger traffic was more than twice as great as it was then. This 1943 record traffic was handled without the prolonged congestion and delays of the first World War period. The 1943 job was done with one-third fewer locomotives, one-third fewer passenger

cars, and one-fourth fewer freight cars than the traffic in 1918, and with 500,000 fewer men. Back of this performance of the railroads was twenty years of improvement in plant, equipment and operating methods made possible by the investment of more than $10,000,000,000 in additions and betterments. Back of it also was twenty years of planned and organized coöperation between carriers, employes and users of transportation, both private and government.

One thing that is probably contributing to the successful handling of the freight of the country at this time is that a great part of it has been material used in the construction of army camps and munition plants, and a large part of it is army supplies and equipment moving from place to place. The movement of this army material has been directed from the Office of Defense Transportation, in Washington, D. C., and they are endeavoring to cut out, so far as possibly can be done, the circuitous routing in handling of freight and are vigilant of the time consumed in loading and unloading cars. I believe this has contributed materially to the splendid performance of the railroads in the last few years.

Locally, a committee of engineers in 1922 made a study of the terminal situation in Saint Louis and suggested certain improvements, many of which have since been carried out, but some of which have not been carried out and perhaps will not be. At that time, the handling of passenger traffic into Saint Louis by the Eastern lines was largely over the Eads Bridge and through the tunnel and it was attended with great discomforts owing to the fuel used on the locomotives, the small bore of the tunnel which got rapidly filled with smoke, and people emerged from their short trip through this tunnel choking with the sulphur fumes.

The committee made a recommendation that all passenger traffic be taken our of the tunnel and rerouted over the Municipal Bridge. At that time, the Municipal Bridge was incomplete as the approaches had not been finished, but it was recommended that it be completed and used for railway passenger travel, thus avoiding the tunnel for all eastbound traffic.

However, in 1934 the Baltimore & Ohio put on an air-conditioned train between St. Louis and Washington, and other railroads rapidly followed with air-conditioning so that the journey through the tunnel lost its discomforts when air-conditioned equipment was used, and since that time, too, special equipment has been built, special engines for hauling passenger trains, so that we now have the air-conditioned, streamlined trains moving all over the country and the tunnels which still exist in several places are no longer the objectionable feature that they once were, but, notwithstanding that fact, the railroads entering Saint Louis from the east are gradually moving over to the Municipal Bridge, so that it is now a journey in the open, and it is believed that in the near future practically all of the passenger trains will use this entrance into Saint Louis.

The pattern of our railroad terminals has been well fixed. Their loca-

tion has been governed by the terrain, generally a level place of ground being selected for the large terminals which consist of a group of long tracks for the receiving of trains, another group of long tracks for the departure of trains, roundhouse and shop facilities, track scales, water, sand, fuel, coal, oil and gasoline, and shop facilities for the repairs of locomotives and cars. These terminals were selected, of course, as near the end of the line as possible and near the business centers of the cities to minimize the switching involved in taking cars to and from these big yards and the industrial section of the city where freight is received and originates.

In many instances these terminals were selected and built before the city property was highly developed around them, and with the extent of these terminal yards it was inevitable that some people would have to live on the other side of the track; however, the objectionable features of these terminal yards have been greatly ameliorated in the last few years by the introduction of the Diesel switching locomotive which has eliminated all the smoke and nearly all the noise in yard operations. That these yards have evolved on a satisfactory standard pattern is evidenced by the fact that in this heavy business which the railroads have experienced in the last three years, the extensive yards in existence have been able to handle all the traffic satisfactorily.

The terminals of our railroads are of great importance to everyone who travels. The terminal is used at the beginning of the journey and one is used at the end, and the convenience experienced in these terminals has a great deal to do with the comfort and popularity of railway travel. It might be well to stop and think of how much we take for granted in travel these days. We expect quick, comfortable transportation and scarcely give a thought to the discomforts that our forefathers experienced when they made a journey. The time was when man made all his journeys on foot, and the early history of the race is a recital of painful treks and migrations attended invariably with privation, terrors and dangers.

When man learned to train and domesticate animals he made some improvement in his transportation, for he seated himself on the backs of horses, camels and elephants, and his journeys either for peaceful or warlike operations became more frequent and greater in extent.

In due course of time some great genius developed the wheel, and man made a great stride forward in civilization, for with animal transportation and wheeled vehicles the migration of peoples became more extensive and on this form of transportation primitive civilization was developed. This form of transportation, existing from very ancient times to the present, served mankind for centuries.

America was colonized by the use of the covered wagon and river flatboats. At a very early date in history, mankind utilized water transportation, first in very frail craft propelled by oars, and finally by sails. With the sail and rudder, man found he could make progress against

wind and tide, so the world was circumnavigated in sailing vessels and some of the most decisive battles in history were fought in sailing ships.

It has been only within the last hundred and twenty-five years, however, that rapid transportation has been perfected. This period covers the development of the railway and steamship, and it is only within the present generation that travel by aircraft and motor bus has been perfected. We now find millions of people traveling by these various ways and indeed many journeys are made where all types of transportation are used in a single trip.

In this city of Saint Louis we have a very good example of the coördination of railway passenger traffic. All trains arrive at and depart from the same station. The operation of trains within the terminal zone is handled by a single agency, and that it is satisfactory and efficient is the universal verdict of travelers through this gateway.

This same principle is being applied to other cities in the country, such as Washington, Kansas City, Denver, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Dallas, and many others, where a single operating agency is handling the passenger business.

It is, of course, impossible to have only one station in every large city. Topographical conditions fixed the locations of railways very largely, and these conditions led to the grouping of railways in certain areas. Thus, we have in Boston two large stations, New York two, Chicago several, possibly reduced to three in time. It is not always desirable to have but one station in a big city.

In considering the question of a single union station for Chicago, a Commission headed by the late John F. Wallace, former President of the American Society of Civil Engineers, pointed out the fact that the volume of traffic through a single station in a city as large as Chicago would congest the streets in the vicinity of the station to such an extent as seriously to interfere with street traffic, and it seems, therefore, that a station with about thirty-six tracks is near the limit for practical purposes.

In large cities, in addition to the ticket offices at the stations, the railways maintain ticket offices in the center of the business district, sometimes in the form of consolidated ticket offices. Where separate offices are maintained they are usually grouped in one block and afford the traveling public every necessary convenience.

Highway Traffic

With the construction of a good road system, the finest that any Nation on earth possesses, it was only natural that this fact would be taken advantage of by many bus companies, so that we now have transportation by bus all over the United States, and freight and passenger service by buses has been coördinated on many railway systems. It was found that many branch lines on the railways were paralleled by concrete highways and it was far cheaper to give the people living along those

branch lines service through buses than by the local trains which formerly ran over them. Therefore, we find hundreds of miles of branch-line railway abandoned and taken up, and service given the people in the territories formerly served by these railways performed by buses handling passengers and freight.

This has led to close coöperation between bus lines and the railways, and nearly all the railways now have supplementary services on the highways, the railway companies owning the equipment. In this way, a real economy has been effected and this service will doubtless be extended after the war when the restrictions on gasoline and tires are removed.

Air Traffic

Airport terminals, by reason of their great size and requirements for level ground, will always be outside of the city limits, and the connections between the airways and railways will be made as at present, by motor vehicles.

A number of important railway lines are acquiring financial interests in air routes and are coördinating their passenger service with the airplane, many journeys being made now partly by train and partly by plane, and the service is coördinated as to schedules and connections. For extremely long distance travel this is very satisfactory.

The Association of American Railroads has made a study of air transportation and has issued a complete report in January, 1944. From this report we find that the average distance of the airport is eight miles from the business district of the city which will necessitate taxi fares to and from airports. For short distances or over-night travel, the airplane will not be as economical as travel by rail. This study has been made in very great detail, and lengthy explanation has been given of the factors favoring air travel and I make two quotations from their report, the first, "Factors Encouraging Air Travel."

> In the domestic air transportation business as it has developed in the United States, many factors have stimulated the year-to-year increase, which show the extent to which the air transport industry has utilized merchandising methods in advertising and selling the speed, comfort, cleanliness, glamour, novelty and other characteristics of its product. To analyze the effect of these factors, they have been broken down in the following general classifications:
>
> (1) Speed, (2) Frequency, (3) Probable saving in cost, (4) Round-trip reductions, (5) Credit cards, (6) Free food—no tips—known cost, (7) Sales commissions, (8) Hotel encouragement, (9) Bus and taxi service, (10) Free parking at airports, (11) Direct service without change, (12) Alternative routings, (13) Prestige of air travel, (14) Avoidance of undressing en route.

I further quote from "Factors Discouraging Air Travel."

> Some of the factors discouraging air travel have proved to be more difficult to deal with than problems involved in physical operation of airplanes themselves. Certain of these drawbacks may never be fully overcome, while others are being gradually reduced.

A general summary of some of the major drawbacks follows: (1) Overcoming fear of family or employers, (2) Possibility of cancellation or delay, (3) Advance reservations a necessity, (4) Reservations from off-airline points, (5) Undependable time of arrival, (6) Time and cost to airport, (7) Limitation of baggage weight without substantial excess charge, (8) Air sickness and other discomforts, (9) Additional hotel bills.

The chances are that there will be a great increase in passenger travel by airplane, and possibly considerable express and mail carried that way. The airplane may be used in trans-oceanic trips and very long continental trips, but the airplane is not likely to displace the railway or the buses for shorter journeys.

Ocean Terminals

In travel by steamship the terminals have been fixed by nature, that is, ports with sufficient depth to accommodate shipping, and the selection of these ports dates back to the time of the earliest navigators. The piers to which ships can unload and load are all necessarily at certain fixed locations, and it is not always possible to have railway connections to all piers, in which case motor vehicles form the connecting link between the ships' sides to stations and depots. A lighterage service is also maintained between railway terminals and ships' sides where the railway terminals are of necessity some distance from the piers.

In many cities, the docks are owned by the municipality, the steamships using them often being foreign owned, and the handling in these cases is through the port authorities, but keen competition between the various cities of the country for the ocean-carrying traffic results in good service being given at these ocean terminals.

A good example of the coördination and close connection between land and water transportation is afforded by the Canadian Pacific Railway at Montreal. This railway is a splendid example of coördination of service all round, as it runs its own sleeping cars, dining cars, hotels, telegraph and express service, grain elevators and steamships, and the Canadian National Railways are developing their service along similar lines.

Inland Waterways

With the development of the Inland Waterway System of the country, it is important to have connections with the barge lines and river steamers. These river terminals are being provided generally at municipal expense, and consist of wharves parallel to the stream, with railways, warehouses, transfer cranes, etc. At these terminals we have a complete transfer from car to barge, and vice versa—in only a few cases is the car switched to the barge. There are some transfer boats, as they are called, plying across the Great Lakes and a service of this kind was maintained prior to the War between Key West and Havana and New Orleans and Havana, known as "sea-trains."

These river terminals will become of greater importance as the

channel depths of our rivers are stabilized and the service becomes dependable. In time probably a great volume of heavy commodities may be handled on the barges instead of the railway lines. There may be some coördinated movement between the railways and the barge lines worked out for the handling of this traffic in the future.

Freight Terminals

The freight terminals of the American Railways were established generally as close to the business districts of the cities as possible. They were established in the days when freight was handled to and from depots in horse-drawn wagons, and at a time when there was very little paving and street conditions were such that long hauls were prohibitive in cost. Many American cities have grown up around the terminals, and depots that were once in the outskirts of the business district are now in the center.

Each railway deemed it necessary to establish its own terminals, so we find very valuable areas in the hearts of our cities given over to the handling of freight. With good paving such as obtains in almost all cities today, and with the quick-moving motor truck, it is no longer essential that these depots be in the heart of the city, and it seems advisable to move them from the business centers, and certainly interchange should be done in outer group yards and switching through cities and across streets minimized as much as possible.

Express Business

We have recently seen extensive coördination of the express business of the country. Many years ago there were numerous express companies, sometimes all serving the same territory. Now practically the entire express business of the country is handled by the Railway Express Agency, and most satisfactorily.

In America, to a much greater extent than elsewhere, the railways preceded the development of the country and many large cities grew up around the original railway intersections or depots. This is particularly true of our western cities such as Kansas City, Oklahoma City, Tulsa, Fort Worth, Dallas, and even Chicago, and many others. In Europe on the other hand, the cities were established centuries before the railroad was developed, and railway terminals had to adjust themselves to the city, rather than the city to the terminals.

Paris is a good example of terminals being established so as not to mar the beauty of the city, there being four principal terminals, kept outside the heart of the city, those serving roads leading to the north, south, east and west respectively, and their subway system, as well as the surface lines and taxicabs, forms a rapid method of connection between these various stations.

The American railroad system has been developed upon the competi-

tive theory in business, and there has been some unnecessary building of trackage and facilities in consequence. This, however, is gradually being eliminated, first by the taking up of an immense trackage where adequate service is being performed by the buses, and it is not likely we will see very much new railroad building in this country, but a rebuilding of great portions of existing lines for the elimination of sharp curvature and heavy grades, looking to a speedier and more comfortable passenger business in competition with the airlines after the present War is over.

Consolidation of Railroads

Regarding the question as to whether consolidations are beneficial or not, there can be no experiment made along these lines until after the War has ended and we are readjusting our present commercial activities to the new world-wide conditions which will follow the establishment of a world-wide peace.

There is a question as to whether it is desirable to group the railroads into large systems, or not. There is the possibility that the systems would become so large that the officers would lose touch with both the employes and patrons, and it would certainly mean that the executives would not be able to keep in direct touch with the operation of their lines to the extent that is possible with smaller systems.

It is possible, from the experience gained in the routing of freight by the Office of Defense Transportation during this war, a central directing agency might be set up in peacetime or regional agencies with branches in the larger terminals where freight movements could be expedited as is now being done by the Office of Defense Transportation, and thus, to a great extent, the benefits of coördination would be accomplished.

The large terminals in and around our cities would be difficult to remove because the industrial development of many cities has grown up around, and close to, these terminals with their switch connections.

In the last few years, a great many grade separations have been made under and over these big terminal yards, so they are no longer an impediment to the free movement of vehicular traffic. In the last few years, too, the car forwarding and distributing companies, with their off-track loading, have helped the traffic situation, so far as the handling of less than carload freight is concerned, in a satisfactory manner.

Effect of Air Travel on Metropolitan Regions

OLIVER L. PARKS, President, Parks Air College, East Saint Louis, Mo.

IN ADDITION to the commercial airports now being developed in all metropolitan cities, we should have airports for the private fliers. These I call Airparks.[1] They should be and can be both beautiful and useful. They should be so designed and landscaped that they will add to real estate values in the area. They should be so located as to be readily accessible in order to assure the maximum of usefulness.

The principles which governed the design of these Airparks, planned especially for the Saint Louis metropolitan area, can be applied readily to the solution of Airpark problems in all communities.

The Suburban Residential Airpark

The airport, for a suburban residential area, has two runways, each 300 feet wide by 2,000 feet long. There are individual hangar accommodations for 450 privately owned airplanes. The hangar units are 70 feet apart, and between each group of units is a taxi strip 100 feet wide. Eighty acres is the minimum area required for an airport of this capacity. An area of 100 acres would permit still more extensive beautification by means of landscaping.

The Downtown Airpark

This proposed downtown Airpark for private planes has landing strips not less than 1,600 feet and not more than 2,000 feet in length and one city block in width. The first 50 feet around the outside will be planted in trees and grass; the next 25 feet will be paved taxi strip; then 25 feet of grass; then 150 feet paved landing strip; then 25 feet of grass; 25 feet taxi strip; and 50 feet of trees and grass on the outside again.

The two landing strips are connected by an underpass wide enough for the airplane to taxi through, going under an important thoroughfare. The two ends of the runways that are closest together and are connected by the underpass, will have underground hangar facilities directly under the runways, 200 feet wide by at least 800 feet, so that, all together we will have a hangar space 1,600 feet by 200 feet, with appropriate taxi aisles and parking space accommodations for about 400 airplanes.

It will also be noted that this layout is designed so that if the runways are one block wide and five blocks long, only two streets will be closed on each landing strip and that the remaining streets can be underpassed.

This proposed site is North of Delmar and East of 12th Street in Saint Louis.

[1]The use of the term Airpark is new, and insofar as it designates landscape treatment of airports, it is excellent; but we deplore the use of the term *park* for uses not connected with parks. Nor do we approve of appropriating park areas for airports or for any other purposes not connected with park administration. We have consistently opposed the use of areas dedicated for parks as sites of public buildings or for underground garages.

THE ELEVATED LANDING DECK

This is a proposed elevated landing deck, especially designed to be built above the railroad yards between 18th Street and 14th Street, and between Chouteau Avenue and Clark Avenue in Saint Louis. The runways are 200 feet wide and 1,600 feet long. There is a lower deck large enough to house 450 medium-sized airplanes with a taxi aisle-way down the center 70 feet wide. There is a ramp at the end of each runway for the landing ships to get out of the way and go down to storage. In this instance, the upper deck is 60 feet above the rails. This same setup would be applicable in almost any major city in the United States. There is a woven steel fence as a guard rail around the outside, something like that on a standard big river bridge.

"The People's Parks"

ROBERT M. EVANS, Member Park Board, Des Moines, Ia.

WITH the attack on Pearl Harbor and the Declaration of War, local, state and national governments were thrown into confusion and hardship. The same was true of industry and your business. Men and women joined or were drafted into the armed forces and replacements had to be made. Soon the normal production of many industries was almost at a standstill, but was quickly converted to war production. There has been, and still is, an all-out effort to win a global war. That rapid change has affected practically every individual, school, industry, home and community. Some cities have lost much that they may never regain. Some have gained much that they may lose.

A few nights ago, at almost exactly midnight, Central Standard Time, an excited, breathless New York announcer cut in on radio programs throughout the Nation to announce the German claim that the Invasion had started. By two-thirty the Allies confirmed the report. Church bells rang and telephones were busy. By four o'clock you could hear the tramping of feet in the street—people on their way to worship, to pray for the safety and the return of loved ones, and to thank God that not a single city in America had been bombed, no evacuations had been necessary, and that our homes had been spared the hostilities of other Nations. By noon offices and stores were closed, giving people an opportunity to gather in reflection. There was sober relief. The tension was off and the great and hazardous step that undoubtedly will bring success, had been taken. Speakers arrived at various meeting places and offered explanations that the War was being fought in the interest of humanity, to preserve civilization, to make a better way of life and to develop world integrity.

Already the processes of unwinding war conditions—the demobilization of our armies, the reconversion of industry—are at work. All over

the country organization after organization is almost feverishly developing the work-pile. Private industry is pledging itself to the work-pile program, and let us hope that industry and business will be as successful in keeping the masses employed as they were in coming to the rescue of production for the prosecution of the War. Employment, and continued employment, is the surest way of preventing further centralization in Washington, and further centralization in Washington is bound to affect local communities adversely.

While employment is our present watchword, and absolutely necessary in our democracy, employment alone in the postwar period will not win this better way of life. There is much to think about and do besides giving work to the masses.

There has never been a period in the last twenty years when so many people have been employed or the pay envelopes so full, yet delinquency has shown a great increase. This upsurge in the teen-age delinquency is not a result of employment, nor is it caused entirely by the excitement and unrest of the war period. It is in a large measure a hangover from the depression years when many serious-minded people honestly believed that the curtailment in municipal budgets should start with our recreational programs. We are now reaping the results of the reduction rather than the expansion of our supervised recreational activities ten years ago. Had we increased our efforts to develop morale in those depression years, corrective measures would not now be so difficult. Those of teen-age now will soon be adults, and fathers and mothers. That fact, as well as others, presents real problems socially.

Our cities have grown. They have their congested areas and their slums and their blighted spots. If we are to give our urban population better living conditions, there must be a recasting of the general area now occupied, correcting the wrong growth or the lack of planning in the past.

In this recasting, redeveloping process, the "People's Parks" should receive paramount consideration. The People's Parks constitute a system made up of individual parks. The People's Parks are one of the most important elements of a good city and good community in which to live. Their rank in importance is alongside schools and churches. They supplement and are an adjunct to our school system. The People's Parks are as much a municipal responsibility as are schools, streets, water, sewers, light, and other municipal services.

The People's Parks, as a system, consist of large parks connected by controlled boulevards, pleasure drives and parkways, neighborhood parks, playgrounds, community houses and other necessary elements as circumstances may require. Their functions are many, but their most important function is to furnish opportunity for recreation and diversion for all classes.

In the past too many of us have thought of recreation only in terms of our children and our youths. Of course we cannot overemphasize the

importance and necessity for active recreation for children and youths, but our planning is behind the times. We have not kept pace with changing conditions. In the past we have seen the work period shortened, and in our readjustments undoubtedly the laboring masses will work shorter hours and the periods of leisure will be lengthened. We must therefore give greater consideration to passive recreation for the adult.

Fifteen years ago a great statesman said:

> Our stage of civilization is going to depend not on what we do when we work so much as what we do in our time off. The moral and spiritual forces of our country do not lose ground in the hours we are busy on our jobs—their battle time is the time of leisure.

If this be true, our planning, generally speaking, is not up-to-date. We have not planned well enough or large enough. Planners for years have recommended one acre of ground per one hundred of people. That measure, of course, would have to vary, depending on many other conditions surrounding a given community and the efficiency of the per-acre area, but it would seem advisable for planners to raise their sights, for we will in the future have a greater number and somewhat different class for whom we must provide greater diversification of diversional activities.

Recreation for the adult is not as simple as it is for children at play or for youths. The building of morale in our people starts at home. Through adult education, providing adequate recreational and diversional activities, we can touch the very bottom of this problem of improving the moral and spiritual forces of our country.

It is not difficult to develop sympathy for underprivileged children and give them a place to play, but what provision has been made for them in so many instances has been done with little thought of the child's mental processes and the building of morale.

We have heard much use of the word *morale*. Morale is an intangible mental virtue. It is a state of mind that makes evasiveness, slacking and cowardice impossible. It is a kind of bodily and mental attitude which makes an individual fit for any task. Morale is the measure of the quality of an individual. Morale is a quality of mind just as *pep* or *condition* is a quality of body. Morale is mental condition. Morale is mental and physical integrity. Morale can be and is acquired. While morale may find aid in hereditary factors, yet it is through environment, experience, teaching and practice that morale is acquired and developed.

A great psychologist has said:

> Unless we go to war at least once in every generation or unless our young men continually open up new frontiers, we will have no sure way of acquiring physical ruggedness and morale except upon the play field. We learn history, art and science in the classroom, but not morale. We acquire certain habits of neatness and persistence in school, but a genuine fighting frame of mind tempered by sportsmanship and good will is one of the first products of the American play field.

The People's Parks in a large sense are the American play field.

If we are to gain this better life for our people, the most interesting and fertile field is in the slum and blighted areas. They usually do not share in the People's Parks system. The areas are congested, and the children playing in the streets often develop antisocial and criminal tendencies. They are very expensive areas as they exist. We can't throw the land away, neither can we burn off the area, but we can with economy improve it by bringing in the People's Parks. We can buy up, rip out, redevelop and open up these areas, and through equipment and supervision improve morale by use of the sand pile, the teeter totter, wading pool, swing, and other play apparatus—taking the youth through the ball-diamond, swimming and tennis-court stages and, working with schools and other agencies, on into useful skills and arts, and a happier existence.

This procedure may sound expensive but the following figures are accepted without much dispute. Twenty percent of our metropolitan areas are slums and blighted areas. They account for 33 percent of the population. They produce only 6 percent of real estate revenue; but they account for 45 percent of major crimes, 55 percent of juvenile delinquency, 50 percent of arrests, 60 percent of tuberculosis, 50 percent of disease, 35 percent of fires, and 45 percent of city service costs.

It is worth repeating that to bring the People's Parks to these areas would improve the morale of the occupants, and would result in economy in the long run.

In our postwar planning, we must in a general way bring the People's Parks to the people. We cannot expect our people to travel too far or to inaccessible places. To accomplish this there is no set formula. We cannot pick up the plan of one city and place it upon another. The work of planning should not be left to the amateur or the layman. The first and most practical economical procedure is to employ those who through experience or education are schooled for that work.

To illustrate park planning procedure it is best and proper to use a familiar example. About twenty years ago the Planning and Zoning Commission of our city became interested in the development of parks and appointed a committee to study the problem of parks and public grounds. That committee in turn hired and brought in from outside city and park planners who, through study, research and planning, pointed the way. We found that fifty years before we had had a board of park commissioners. They were men of vision and integrity, and they did a good job. While the board existed they laid a foundation by purchasing large parks that today are the backbone of our park system. However, the board was short-lived. In 1908 the city government changed, abolished the board of park commissioners and set up a single Park Commissioner subject to election every two years. For the next twenty-three years practically no progress was made. Few extensions in acreage

were accomplished and such purchases as were made were untimely, haphazard and expensive, creating indebtedness for the city. What one commissioner built another was apt to destroy and beautiful areas were ill treated. Payroll padding developed and three people were sentenced to prison. The park business was in the *doghouse* and in politics. There should be no indictment of the commissioners. The fault was in the system of government. There could be no long-time planning, no continuity of development.

Four years after the report of the planners, our State Legislature was encouraged to place on the statutes of Iowa a law establishing a Park Board. It is not a perfect law, nor broad enough, but it is helpful.

When the new Board took over, the planners pointed out that we did not have a good playground in the city. None was fenced or properly equipped. There were no decent shelter houses for supervision, no hard-surfaced roads in the parks, only one swimming pool, improperly placed, no pleasure drives worth mentioning and no river improvement, although two beautiful rivers ran through the city.

Our Board would not claim all the credit for what has been accomplished in the thirteen years that the Park Board has existed up to date. We had gifts of money and lands from public-spirited citizens, and some property from people living out of the State. We received some Federal aid as most cities did, but in the main our developments, extensions and improved operations have been accomplished through savings over the old system, in spite of the fact that the cost of materials, salaries and the hourly wage have increased. Our playgrounds are fenced and equipped. Many shelter houses have been constructed. The river front is improved and the roads in the parks hard-surfaced. Two golf courses have been revised, enlarged and improved. One beautiful club house has been built and two swimming pools completed. Seventy thousand trees and shrubs from our own nursery have been planted. Formal gardens and greenhouses have been built or improved, and there are many other accomplishments too numerous to mention.

Our work is only begun, and emphasis is being placed not so much on what we have accomplished as on the fact that we are established and are conscious of our responsibilities.

If, in the postwar period, we will emphasize our recreational programs, correct our laws, take the People's Parks out of politics, establish permanence and continuity through Boards or Park Commissioners, use professional planners as a guide, plan larger and better areas, and bring the parks to the people who need them most, we will interest more people who will hopefully, courageously, even militantly strive to make the lives of our people more spiritual and more delightful.

The Plan, the Press and the Citizen

STEPHEN C. NOLAND, Editor, the Indianapolis News and
Chairman, Indiana Economic Council, Indianapolis, Ind.

MY SUBJECT, "The Plan, the Press and the Citizen," is the result of a hasty approval of a suggestion that was probably tossed out merely to stimulate some response on my part. It is a good subject, with the exception of one word—the word *plan*. As I pondered the scope of the subject, and ranged back through my experience to discover what, if anything, I might dredge up that would contribute to this important conference, I saw that the word *plan* should have been the word *planner*.

The reason for this belief is the very simple one that I am wholly unequipped to discuss the plan. I have no technical knowledge and little lay knowledge of plans for the betterment of community life. But a somewhat extensive acquaintance with planners, and latterly a rather close association with them, does embolden me to believe that a newspaperman of long, and perhaps not wholly upright, experience might tell this conference something that might be helpful to planners in bringing about the conversion of their beautifully drawn and technically flawless pictures and plans into housing projects, boulevards, parks, recreation centers and all the other stars in the crown of civilized community life to which the citizen points with pride when showing a visitor around his home town.

I would not have it believed that I am overlooking the very practical matter of how a professional planner persuades the appropriate authorities in a city to engage his service. I am well aware that there can be no plan until the city council or the county board or the village selectmen have laid the money on the line to pay the planner for making his survey, preparing his report and laying out his plans. But I hope that as my remarks on subsequent steps in the process, particularly as they relate to the press and the citizen, are disclosed, the planner will glean something which may be helpful to the prosperity of his business.

We are to assume then, I take it, that some helpful suggestions about the use of the press—and when I say press I include radio to some extent, in campaigns to carry the day for some kind of planning project would be welcome. How shall you approach the press? What may you reasonably expect to gain by press support, or by lack of press opposition? Or should you steer clear of the press until in its own good time it discovers the benefits of planning and comes to you for help?

The proper and conventional approach to the press in such matters is on the crusade plateau. That is the newspaper choice, for newspapers that are worth their salt, love to crusade. It is by crusading for good government and the progressive adoption of worthy plans for a better

community life that newspapers justify the freedom of the press, guaranty of the Constitution and create in the public mind the impression that they are the conscience and perhaps something of the Sir Galahad of the community.

When conditions are right, the crusade is by far the best method of utilizing the influence of the press to bring about a desirable planning project. But to be effective, the contrasts must be bold and clashy. There must be a villain, preferably a notorious political boss, or political machine, which is robbing the public and mistreating women and children. There must be a body of high-minded citizens, with a fair sprinkling of representatives of the crowded and blighted areas. And there must be a fight. News is what people run to see. And a fight is their first choice.

The best way to arouse the press to the crusading pitch is to avoid with the utmost care any reference to its duty or its power. The press should always be made to believe that it originated a crusade, that it alone saw the menace of the forces of evil, and that it started the fight. If the press is openly goaded into a crusade and must depend for its inspiration on an outside group, such as a committee of planners, it is too well equipped with alibis for a setback, or perhaps for cooling off at what may prove to be a critical moment in the campaign.

The planner is the key man in this preliminary stimulation and assembly of the materials of battle. He should be definite and forceful in his presentation of the case for improvement, but he should by all means and at all times conduct himself as a highly inspired idealist who is largely indifferent to costs and the fine art of making democracy work on the ward and precinct front. If he patently knows his business, and makes no compromises with perfection, he becomes the concealed but actual leader of the conflict. He should be so sparing of his praise when even a rather important gain is made that even a smile from him will whip up both the citizens' group and the press to a new height of endeavor.

Under no circumstances should the planner be drawn into the public phase of the struggle. He should be kept handy for appearances before small groups of intellectuals and a few others who may really be interested in good planning. But he should be kept well out of the line of fire. He should not make public statements about planning. The enemy will twist and distort anything that he says, and the crusading newspaper will have to back up and defend the planner instead of fighting the enemy.

From the newspaper view, the tough part of such a crusade is picking the right enemies. The plural is used for the reason that there must be more than one enemy, yet they must be made to appear as one.

In trying to arouse the interest and enlist the aid of the masses who will be most benefited by the project, it is well to avoid any uncomplimentary reference to the boss or the machine. The reasons for this tactic is that the boss is the friend of the masses. Usually the masses, not only

vote as he directs, but they admire him for his success in holding on against the power of the press and the champions of good citizenship, and at the same time staying out of jail. It is a kind of game. They like it.

Furthermore, they are not much interested in any kind of planning. They can see the value of planned traffic safety. They will turn out to fight for the safety of their children on the way to and from school. And they will lift a hand for a playground if it is nearby. But when it comes to vast projects for the improvement of the public health, for public recreation, for speeding up and safeguarding the traffic flow, and for orderly city expansion, they will not budge on their own power. They expect somebody else to do that job, just as they expect somebody else to build and operate the school system.

The enemy that they love to hate and blame for their troubles is a sort of nebulous combination of bad luck and a conspiracy by the rich and fortunate to exploit them. If they cannot have a nice car, they want a good excuse for not having one. The man who cannot win his wife's approval with a fur coat, must have an alibi that will win her sympathy. He must have a good excuse handy when the kids want to know why they cannot go to one of those summer camps they read about in the paper.

So the enemy that really gets the fire up in the mass of people must be identified in very general terms. He must be described as a vicious foe of progress, an enemy of the more abundant life, a Nazi-hearted exploiter of the average God-fearing citizen, a claimant of special privilege and a big taxpayer.

If this mythical enemy of society is well constructed, he makes a fine devil. In the minds of the masses he is whoever happens to irritate them —the boss of the factory, the bill collector, the grumpy old man next door who is always yelling at the kids, the high cost of living, the cops.

And, of course, in the minds of the good citizens, he is none other than the crooked political boss. The good citizens have their troubles, too. They have the same yearning for a scapegoat. They must have something with which to gild over their failure to apply their superior talents to the drudgery of political work and public administration. The political boss is their meat.

But the good citizen's views are the best ammunition in the campaign. He will make statements, attend luncheons of small but influential business leaders, help to arrange and finance meetings at which community leaders will make appearances and construct a good front for the campaign.

The fact that he will not get out among the people and attempt to gain converts by personal appeal, or that he will not work at the polls if the issue comes to electing the right people or approving a bond issue, should not be held against him. His apparent indifference should not discourage the hopeful onlooker, especially the little company of planners. Now and then these people can be roused to assert their political power,

which, when inspired, recruited and well led, is invincible, but it is in their nature to allow the lowbrow to run things most of the time and to get their satisfaction out of telling each other how much better they could do the job if they, as good citizens, could afford to risk the sullying of their good names in the heat and brick-throwing of a political campaign.

There must, of course, be a command post for the operation, and there must be a commander-in-chief. The ideal man for commander is the managing editor of the newspaper. His staff should consist of his own workers. All the activities of the supporting citizens' groups should be cleared across his desk. He should have full power to break his stories when they will do the most good for the whole crusade, and he should be equipped with a blanket pardon for all the mistakes he may seem to make in his zeal to pour it on when pouring it on will do the most good.

Working in complete coöperation with him will be, of course, the editorial page of the paper. It will spot its shots and some of its lines of attack may seem to be inconsistent with the general plan of action. But leave that to the strategic genius of the editorial director. He generally knows where the bodies are buried and what he has to say that seems to be far off the subject may be a cryptic hint about an old paving scandal, or the possible prologue to an inquiry about who got the money from the lighting contract.

If the crusade is highly inspired, carefully planned and persistently pressed, there will come a time when a strong prospect of success may be followed by what seems to be a loss of courage and aggressiveness.

This will not occur if there has been a change of administration involving the defeat of the boss and his machine and the induction of an administration which is so far committed to the objective that victory is a mere matter of official ratification. But that degree of success is the exception. Rather more often the boss and his machine will see the handwriting on the wall and ask for an armistice. If this seems to be a good trading position, the public campaign must be kept alive, but on a subdued basis. The ground must be prepared for a graceful surrender by the boss. Yet there must be a degree of persistence that will enable the boss to convince his associates that they must yield ground or risk total defeat.

At this point, the idealist leadership, the visionaries who have been encouraged to make no compromises, must be patient and forbearing.

For it is very likely that from then on the crusade director will have to be less than wholly frank with the planners and the idealists. If the boss elects to talk business, he will have something to sell and his price may be a trifle high. There will be some bickering, and in good time the negotiations may reach the stage of public consideration. This will be in the form of an ordinance laid before the council or the board of estimates or other purse-string body, calling for the appropriation of money to buy land, let contracts for construction, and convert the bright dream of the planners into community embellishment.

At that stage, which is the final crisis, it is best for the planners and all active members of the committees on civic betterment and uplift to take a vacation out of town, or at least to busy themselves with some other activity which will gratify their higher natures and occupy all their spare time.

It is then the function of the newspaper crusader to follow his instincts and, if new situations arise, to do the best he can with his intelligence. He must also be intensely practical. He may, and probably will, have a phone talk or two with the political boss over the private phones which each maintains for practical emergencies.

When the money begins to roll, and rumors are heard that the political boss had some land options in advance of decisions made by orderly procedure, or that his brother-in-law got the road oil or aggregate contract, or the chairman of the fourth ward seemed to have a monopoly of street light standards it will be the newspaper crusader's turn to take a vacation. He has to make good. He has to risk the accusation that he no longer knows what is going on in the city hall, hence is slipping, or that he does know and cannot tell, or perhaps that he took up a new crusade or warmed over an old one before he finished the planning job.

But when the job is completed, and there is a big celebration, with speeches and the introduction of public officials and civic leaders, whose efforts contributed so much to this splendid example of public enterprise and the functioning of democracy for the benefit of all, the dim stages of the crusade will be forgotten and the rumors of shady deals and graft will die down, and the boss will be very happy to prove to the masses that he did the job, deserves the credit, and, if returned to power at the next election, can be trusted both to win justice for his followers and to see that they have plenty of grievances to reconcile them to the hardships of life.

A correct appraisal of the whole experience, from the first suggestion by the planners to the better health and more carefree laughter of the children and the more wholesome satisfaction of their parents, will yield praise for everyone according to his contribution. But it will demonstrate again that the key man was the idealist, the visionary slightly discouraged by repeated collisions with harsh reality. He was the flag and the creed that men carried as a symbol of what they would have been had they had the spiritual equipment, the courage in the right, and the professional proficiency of the planner.

Applied Plans as Seen in Syracuse

GUY GREER, Board of Editors, Fortune Magazine, New York

ABOUT a year and a half ago, we were looking around for a moderately large city which would be more or less typical of American cities; would be willing to undertake a very thoroughly comprehensive planning job, and would let us watch it. In return for that, we would undertake to put some expert consultants at their disposal and perhaps do a little kibitzing on the side, ourselves. So, after looking around, we finally hit upon Syracuse.

I shall not tell you much about the technical side of the planning there. You will have a chance, if you have not already, to read about that. I should like merely to remark that we expected and Syracuse expected the project to break new ground in at least two principal directions. First, in the thoroughness of the groundwork of research and study back of the planning, combined with the very wide scope of it—the wide scope geographically. Syracuse happens to be in the middle of a fairly large county. Therefore, the planning organization was set up to include both the city and the county, so as to make dead sure that as far as the planning was concerned, at least, it would be on a broad enough base.

The other direction in which we hoped to break new ground was in the extent and quality of public understanding of and participation in the planning. It was the announced ideal, which of course never in the world could be attained, to have every man, woman and child in Syracuse and Onondago County not only aware of the planning but taking some sort of active part in it. I shall have a little more to say presently on how very important that part of the program turned out to be.

In pondering over what has been going on in Syracuse, we have come to some tentative conclusions about planning problems in general. Let me add that I am not sure that these are the same conclusions that Syracuse itself has come to; so, if I say anything that Syracuse should not like, Syracuse and Onondago County are not at all committed.

One of the first things that seemed necessary in trying to get the whole experiment there into perspective, was to formulate in words a picture of what a modern city might be. And so, the other day, I undertook to set down in a little essay of two pages, a vision of a city of the future. I shall just take time out to read it to you, if I may.

You can make your home town beautiful, convenient, and truly fit for the pursuit of happiness. Beautiful, not merely in spots but all over. Convenient, not just for a few rich people with chauffeured limousines, but for everybody. Fit for the pursuit of happiness, because freed from the scrouging and shoving, the din and confusion, and all the nerve-punishing aspects of urban life that now make people scowl and snarl and bark at each other.

Imagine for a moment that your city and its suburbs and the surrounding countryside have actually undergone the treatment they need. In this transformed community, you can live anywhere you like—in an apartment or any

kind of house you can afford, so long as it does not crowd the dwellings of others. To almost any extent you wish, you can enjoy the advantages of both town and country living. You can, nevertheless, have all the material and spiritual benefits of communion with your fellows; for speed of travel will have taken the place of the need for close proximity.

If you happen to relish the jostling of crowds, you can still enjoy as much of it as you like, because you can always travel quickly and comfortably to the local equivalent of New York's Times Square.

You will live in a clean, orderly, wholesome neighborhood, for there will be no other kind. Yet in all likelihood you can, if you want to, walk to work. Probably your wife and children can walk to the store, to school, to church, to the playground, to the movies; at the worst they can take a bus or drive an automobile without endangering life and limb by dodging the traffic of a highway.

If you want to drive your car downtown or fly in whatever permissible contraption you happen to own, you can do so quickly and pleasantly, and then you can find at once a place, off the streets, to park. If you want to live in the suburbs or even in the open country and still work downtown, this will be easy; most people will prefer walking to work, hence those who want to ride will have plenty of room.

If you want to buy a house or other property, you can do so with fair assurance that its value will be preserved. While there will continue to be plenty of growth and change, the danger of your investment being wiped out by a run-down neighborhood will be virtually eliminated. Your real estate taxes will be lower, rather than higher, yet your city will be in good shape financially, for your local government will have broken out of the vicious spiral now strangling it, of revenues lagging behind expenditures, mounting taxes, and flight of the wealthiest citizens to the suburbs.

When you go for a stroll—whether from home or from work, or wherever you live or work—you will come upon parks and gardens. Trees and shrubs and green grass will be abundant on all sides. Often there will be fountains and ponds and brooks of clear water. And of course there will be no unsightly advertising or ugly business shacks to offend the eye. A large measure of beauty will thus be inherent in the setting of the community, whereupon the buildings and all other externals will have a chance to give expression to the good and spacious life within.

Is all this a description of Utopia, a dream of starry-eyed planners? It is not Utopia nor is it a dream, except in the sense that all plans for the future are dreams. Your city or any other urban community in America can achieve these things for itself—if it really wants to, and the legislature of its State or States will let it.

Now, I propose to come rather suddenly down out of that stratospheric level and discuss for a little while what is involved in making this dream come true. For it does have some very big *ifs*.

As we of FORTUNE have undertaken to summarize the task—that is, the task of turning plans into reality—there are three main phases of the job. First, you have to bring under public control the decentralization movement. This will involve legal and administrative problems of peculiar difficulty. It must be tackled both from within and from without.

The second main task is to bring up-to-date the *in-town* pattern of the community. The big problems, of course, are slums and blighted areas, relief of traffic congestion through plentiful off-street parking and

loading space, the loosening up of over-crowded areas and the provision of more open space.

And, finally, of course, underlying and interpenetrating everything else, you have to improve and coördinate all forms of transportation and the terminals for them.

Now in order to accomplish these three main tasks, there are three big hurdles to be got over—three big problems. First of all, you have got to make the government of the local community fit the community geographically. There is no use trying to fool ourselves; if we have cities, even small cities, made up of large numbers of independent municipal governments competing with each other in laxity of regulations in order to entice business or residents away from each other, you simply cannot get hold of this decentralization problem.

The second main hurdle, which of course goes hand in hand with the legal and administrative set-up, is a great overhauling of the fiscal structure. Those of you who heard Dr. Heller this morning (See page 65) realize how tremendously important that is.

Among other things, the overhauling of the fiscal structures must relieve the now unbearable burden of taxation on real estate. That is something we have simply got to tackle. If we expect in the face of the virtual certainty that local expenditures in cities will go on increasing, if we expect to continue to load that burden onto real estate, we will enormously aggravate the very conditions causing the disintegration and decay of the interior of the cities.

This overhauling of fiscal structure will unavoidably involve a great reshuffling of taxation and expenditures throughout the whole fiscal set-up of the Nation, local, state and Federal. You have heard this morning a very clear analysis of that problem as presented in the excellent report of the Professors Groves, Gulick and Newcomer (See page 65), and I heartily commend it to you.

The third hurdle, the third obstacle to achieving this dream city of the future, is to clean up the accumulation of errors of the past, particularly the slums and blighted areas. The community must be put into a position to make something like a new fresh start. If the fiscal reforms are obtained, the communities will have the choice, either of accomplishing this clean-up job with their own resources over a long period of years or of asking financial help from the Federal Government to do it in a hurry. Of course they might ask financial help from the state government but I am very much afraid that would not get them very far. It is rather remarkable that the manner in which several States whose governors are very prominent just now, have managed by great good luck to build up substantial surpluses in the state treasury. Those governors actually give the impression that that is their own cash and that they are misers sitting over it. Not a penny will they consider turning over to the cities and towns.

I shall not attempt to discuss the problem of Federal aid to the cities

for this clean-up job, except to remark that as most of you know there are two bills in Congress now providing for it. And, in favor of those bills, I would only make this remark: that for many, many years, only the Federal Government has been able to get at the bulk of all the tax revenues in the cities and towns. Something like ninety percent or more of all the revenues collected in the country comes out of the cities and towns. For, all these years, the Federal Government has had access to this tax money, and the cities have not. They have strangled real estate well nigh to death and still, in spite of their relatively good position just now, as far as the future is concerned, they are faced with something like bankruptcy.

Now it is perfectly obvious that without these great fiscal reforms, they cannot do anything to solve the problem of slums and blighted areas. It is equally evident that, even with the fiscal reforms, it will be a great many years before they can do the job. If the job is done in a hurry they will have to get help from the Federal Government; and the justification for that help, apart from the fact that the predicament of the cities is so great a problem that it is one of national scope, is the fact that in reality, they will simply be receiving back from the Federal Government money that they ought to have had access to for many years in the past.

One more word on that before I go to something else. I think it is of the most vital importance, if there be Federal aid to the cities, that it be extended to them without any considerable conditions. In other words, the actual administration and expenditure of that money must be a matter of local responsibility. Only the most elementary, minimum, commonsense standards as to planning should be insisted upon by the Federal Government.

In that connection, I should like to throw out to you, to think about, this idea: given our Federal system, given the fact that there are so many functions of national concern which are performed locally, we have got to compromise to some extent with the principle that the agency of government which raises the money shall be responsible for spending it. Or turn it around the other way, that the agency responsible for spending money must be the agency collecting it. We are going to be compelled, I think, in a great many instances, to look upon the Federal Government merely as a tax collector, which we hire to do a job for us; and once it has done the job of collecting the taxes, and has turned back the part that we need in the cities, its responsibility is finished. It has nothing to say about how the money is spent.

Now that, of course, at once brings up a very ticklish problem of holding the local governments to a high level of efficiency, not to mention integrity. I think we have got to rely for that check on local governments essentially on public opinion. And in order to make public opinion function, we have got to compel the local governments to publish full and complete reports as to how they expended the funds. I

mean by that, reports so clear and so simple that everybody can understand them. That, in the last analysis, is the best and about the only safeguard a democratic society can have against faulty administration of public funds.

I should like to devote the rest of the time at my disposal to a few words about the first of these great hurdles: the problem of making your local government fit the geographic local community. We have had in this country for many years—I believe it started in Missouri—a great movement called *Home Rule*, a movement that sounds fine and in principle was excellent. Actually, that movement has been so distorted, so twisted out of its original intention, that in all probability it is doing more harm than good. It is perfectly possible now in any large city—I am sure it is in Saint Louis—to appeal to the local pride of the scores of municipalities—there may be hundreds here for all I know, there are 456 in the New York metropolitan area—appeal to the local pride of these communities to prevent the simple degree of consolidation of functions which is indispensable to cope with these great problems, particularly the problem of decentralization, the problem of guidance and control of the development of the suburbs and satellites.

I shall not go farther into this thing at the moment, except to outline rather dogmatically to you what is going to be required, in my opinion, to solve the problem.

Each of the States should pass at once a permissive statute or enabling act in some such terms as these: any municipal, county or other unit of local government is authorized to exercise certain powers, and these powers, of course, would be enumerated later; to consolidate with any neighboring municipality or other unit of local government for the exercise of these powers; and finally, to include in the consolidation all the area within the metropolitan district—as defined, say, by the United States Bureau of the Census.

Let me repeat that last proposition: this permissive legislation I am talking about would permit a consolidation of a limited number of powers, and it would permit compelling every municipality in the area to join, provided the scheme were worked out and submitted to a democratic popular vote. The democratic popular vote should work something like this: adoption of the scheme for the whole area would require a majority vote in a majority of the governmental units, plus an absolute majority in the whole area. That would preserve completely the principles of democracy, and it would also prevent any particular municipality or group in the area from nullifying the whole scheme by refusing to go along with it.

Now I dare say some of you are thinking that this thing I have just outlined is a counsel of perfection, that it would be completely impossible. I dare say it would, if you tried it full-fledged, so to speak. The only hope I can see to get such arrangement is through a widespread public under-

standing of the problems involved. And that is essentially a job of education—for the planners in collaboration with the radio, the schools, the newspapers, in a great campaign of education.

If I had more time I could tell you a rather fascinating story about how such a campaign has been waged in Syracuse. But I shall end with the flat assertion that the most positive of all the conclusions we have drawn from the Syracuse project is, that the essentials of the planning aims and needs must be translated into commonsense language and then got over to the public. If I as an economist were given the liberty of sermonizing a group of planners, I would say to them: "Learn how to tell what you are doing without the use of technical jargon." If you say you cannot, I tell you most emphatically that you are mistaken. Syracuse has proved it up to the hilt.

DISCUSSION

FROM AUDIENCE: I would like to ask Mr. Greer if he would care to report on what use of radio programs they made in reporting to the poeple of Syracuse.

MR. GREER: The radio part of the program there was probably the most interesting of the whole story. It would take too long to describe it fully. But I will try to give you a thumbnail sketch.

A series of seventeen broadcasts was organized, under the title "Syracuse on Trial." Those broadcasts came in the middle of Sunday afternoons, and they had a perfectly extraordinary listener response.

At each broadcast, a full courtroom scene, including judge, lawyers, jury, witnesses and so on—lawyers for the defense and for the prosecution—was constituted and got over beautifully in description to the public. Then the community of Syracuse and Onondaga County was haled into court and tried on various charges.

The first program was "What is this community going to do with the returning soldier?" Another trial was on "What is going to be done about the lovely little lake in the city that has been more or less ruined, at least one side of it ruined, by a big industrial company?"

Other questions were: what Syracuse was going to do about bringing into the community all these separate municipalities around it; what Syracuse was going to do about housing; what it was going to do about blighted areas; what it was going to do about downtown traffic congestion? That is as many as I can think of at the moment. There were seventeen of them altogether. They were dramatized so successfully that the listener interest, I think, must have been well-nigh breathless. I heard one or two directly and heard the rest of them on records.

At the end of the trial, the judge charged the jury. All the rest of the program was rehearsed, of course; but the jury decision was not, and it was sometimes very disconcerting not to say aggravating, to some of the interests involved.

Well, something like the Crosley Radio Polls were taken, and they showed about the largest listening audience of any program of any of the four stations in Syracuse.

Among those responsible, Syracuse University should probably be handed the biggest bouquet for the series; because it was the University workshop that worked out all the technical aspects of it. There was a distinct feeling that the level of interest and understanding of the objectives, and even the methods of the planning project, were more thorough in that community than had ever been achieved anywhere else.

MRS. LANGSDORF: I would like to ask a question of Mr. Greer. Mr. Greer, you stated that you believe in the fact that this Government should support or help support a postwar project; I wanted to ask you whether you think that support should be given something in the way that the Social Security Commission receives its support? That is, the community gives so much, the Federal Government gives so much, or is it to be out and out Federal support of such a project?

MR. GREER: Well, to answer that question fully, I would have to take an hour or so in a very minute analysis of the problem. The kind of thing I had in mind was the kind of thing contemplated in the Thomas and the Wagner bills. And that is simply a loan, a sort of conditional loan to the cities, to clean up their slums and blighted areas, and give them a new, fresh start. The conditions for obtaining such loans would be only two in number; one, that a satisfactory overall plan, meeting certain commonsense minimum standards, should be presented; and second, that in the matter of repayment, the taxing power, the full faith and credit of the community, would not be pledged. The only security for repaying the loans would be the property itself, and if the property did not pay enough to repay the Federal advances, the loss would be written off as the price the present generation has to pay for the mistakes of past generations. As a matter of fact, I am pretty sure that in this particular case the matching principle would not work. Moreover, I think it is a completely lousy principle anyway. It simply puts more money into States that do not need it and less into the States that do need it.

Postwar Planning for Democracy in Cleveland

S. BURNS WESTON, Executive Director, Postwar Planning Council of Greater Cleveland, Ohio

I AM always suspicious of the well-laid plans of mice and men until I understand the philosophy that motivates their efforts. After all Hitler had an efficient machine, but for what purpose? At the risk therefore, of repeating the self-evident, what about the purpose?

It is easy to forget that the most far-reaching and thorough planning the world has ever seen is going on before our very eyes. In every respect it is social and economic planning, but planning in reverse. It is war. It is destruction. It is costly and ghastly and a tremendous indictment of the stupidity of the human race. Yet war became necessary because Hitler demonstrated that it is possible to plan to destroy the very human freedoms that make for democracy.

Our task at home, our responsibility to the men on the fighting fronts, is to insure the victory they are winning. This means we must plan as comprehensively and imaginatively to keep democracy as we do in organizing all our talents and resources to eliminate those who would destroy it. It is not simply a question of industrial reconversion. We must redesign and reconvert *all* of our war energies to a peacetime economy. We must earn democracy. It does not wait on our doorstep.

We are discussing here postwar planning at the community level. This is just another way of saying community planning that has been neglected. There are a few who feel that the solution of postwar community problems is so dependent upon the national and international scene that communities must wait for the leadership to come from Washington. I do not think that people in Washington want that to happen but if Washington has been over-zealous in assuming responsibility for social and economic problems, let us not forget that for the most part the States and local communities have stood in abject default, with their hand out ready to receive.

I believe that a change is coming about. More and more people realize that the future of democracy in America rests with local communities; that unless the great majority of our urban areas learn how to harness the best intelligence and leadership from all walks of life, there is not a chance in the world of avoiding further centralization at the Federal level. We will continue to require a strong central government; but we cannot ask it alone to salvage our urban areas, else real democracy in this country will become a tired page in the history book and the source of its vigor anemic. This is not to say that local communities should organize themselves to operate independently from neighboring communities, the State or the Nation, but it is to say that they can determine for themselves the kind of community they want and then take the initiative to tell the State and Federal Governments what they must do to make it possible for local communities to live and prosper. This they

must do in order to provide a fertile soil for intelligent coöperation with the State and Federal Governments and in which they can decentralize. The Federal Government alone cannot save democracy. The trickle-down-from-the-top theory will not work.

Science and technology should have convinced us by now that human beings are interdependent whether as part of a Nation, a State or a community. This is true in urban areas more than elsewhere where people see the complexity and interdependence of their many problems more clearly than ever before, although they are less certain about the best techniques to use. It is not an easy task. It will require courage. There are selfish interests to combat. All is not sweetness and light.

In Cuyahoga County, a metropolitan area of 463 square miles, there are 54 separate municipalities. We, as other urban areas, face the same problems, the same threats to democracy and its freedoms—postwar unemployment; the needs of returning service men; a healthy environment in which management and labor can thrive (including a coöperative attitude between labor and management); slums and blighted areas; inadequate health care and recreational facilities; obsolete and outmoded transportation facilities; the need of reducing the tax rate and at the same time of finding more public revenue; the necessity of expanding social services; intelligent handling of interracial questions; and an educational system alert to new trends and requirements.

I do no more than name some of the problems. I prefer to draw your attention to the matter of techniques for action. In social and economic progress we still have difficulty in moving from bull sessions about problems to action. In Greater Cleveland, as in many other urban areas, we have undertaken to establish a machinery to meet these problems cooperatively. This is real pioneering. The techniques we use today may be obsolete tomorrow. What may be possible or desirable in Cleveland may be unsound for San Francisco, Syracuse, Louisville or Detroit. In Cuyahoga County no statutory body exists on a metropolitan basis to coordinate the attention on community problems. Nor is there any immediate possibility of one coming into being. So we have approached the task semi-officially.

In 1937 the Regional Association was established. You remember, those were the days when it was not safe to say Regional *Planning* Association. It was and is a non-profit, non-partisan organization, concerned with comprehensive physical planning on a metropolitan basis. It provided the first technical physical planning in Cuyahoga County and did much to stimulate interest and make possible the reorganization and revitalization of the City Planning Commission under due legal authority, nearly 2 years ago. Although its responsibility is limited to the City of Cleveland proper it too has made the entire community more physical-planning conscious. As a result the Regional Association now devotes its major attention to the correlation of research, has an excellent

library, conducts studies that may be required and carries out an educational program to stimulate enlightened citizen participation in physical planning matters. It is presently engaged in an outstanding piece of work in Neighborhood Conservation, through genuine neighborhood participation.

Because postwar problems are broader than physical planning and so many different agencies were working on the questions involved, it was decided that an over-all metropolitan coördinating body be formed.

In July, 1943, The Postwar Planning Council of Greater Cleveland was initiated by the Mayor of Cleveland upon the request of a number of leading citizens. The Mayor presented the idea to over 150 representatives of every type of interest who authorized the appointment of an Organization Committee to recommend the structure and functions of a citizens body to coördinate and stimulate postwar planning in the whole social and economic field.

In Cleveland we believe that there are four essential elements that must be given expression in any such body.

First, the organization itself must be a true cross-section of every social, economic and political interest in the area. In the past, local communities have sought to deal with community problems through organizations or individuals that represent only a limited part of the interest of the entire community. We have relied for example, upon public officials and agencies, the Chambers of Commerce, trade associations, labor unions, educational institutions, social service organizations, the churches and civic groups, although each represents but one part of the entire community. Each has a different and useful function, but if community policy and programming is desirable, then all parts of the community must share in formulating the policy and carrying out the program. Pooling the energy and resources of all interests would seem to be simple and obvious. It is amazing only that we have been so slow to do it.

The general membership of our Postwar Planning Council is made up of representatives of every organization, social, economic, political, cultural and religious, that has any concern with or responsibility for the postwar welfare of the community. Also part of the general membership are the Trustees. While selected as individuals, nevertheless as a group they also represent a cross-section of the interests of the community. The Board of Trustees is responsible for the property and affairs of the Council, a non-profit corporation. It now numbers 57 but has an Executive Committee to which is delegated the supervision of all routine business and acts for the Trustees in the interim between the Board's meetings.

The second requirement the people of Greater Cleveland have laid down, is that the Council serve as a coördinating and not operating body. Greater Cleveland, like other urban areas, has many operating organizations, public, semi-public and private. The need therefore, is to make sure

that their total energies meet the total requirements of the community. Specifically, we think of coördination not simply as a means of bringing together the different individuals or groups who are working on the same problem, but of bringing together also the different interests that have a stake in the solution of the problem. It is not just a matter of finding out what other people are doing in the hope that they will agree not to duplicate each other's efforts. Instead we bring together those citizens with the most direct social, economic and professional interest in a given question who represent all possible divergent viewpoints. By working together, their responsibility is to reach agreement upon a policy that will best serve the interest of the entire community. Necessarily, they must realize that each individual or each group with a different view cannot have his own way entirely; that there must be give and take. The important thing is that there be a positive community policy determined by a representative group, in order that the maximum energy of the community can be centered upon the action that must follow if the plans or policies are to have meaning.

The third requirement is that the community problems considered be real and basic, regardless of how controversial they are. Clearly this requires careful attention to coördination of the specific policies that are recommended by the different panels. An obvious case in point is, of course, the necessity of making certain that money is available to pay for any public improvements that are planned or suggested.

The fourth essential is public interest, understanding and participation in regard to the specific recommendations of the various panels. Getting together all social, economic and political groups who represent many divergent viewpoints gives the community a new "voice" which is qualified to speak for all groups and is in a position to command the confidence of people in every walk of life. Unless community organizations concerned with postwar planning make the most of their opportunity to sound out the public and speak through all media of contact, they may well forfeit much of the interest required to put across their program.

In Cleveland we have not yet undertaken this phase of the work although the Board of Trustees has declared itself in favor of a program of public participation. Our Board feels that the question of timing is of utmost importance and is reluctant to go ahead with an extensive public participation program until the panels have reached at least some preliminary conclusions. Due to lack of time and personnel we have not even done an adequate job of keeping the membership of the Council properly informed of the activities that are going on. It is important to note, however, that the participation of the people serving on the panels in itself constitutes a substantial type of public participation.

Specifically what have we done to date? We began our work in January of 1944. The first need was to organize into a non-profit corporation and to make sure that the Board of Trustees was properly representative.

With that done and an office established we appointed a panel on Major, Immediate Problems consisting of one of the newspaper editors, the president of the Standard Oil Company of Ohio and then president of the Chamber of Commerce, a representative of organized labor and the planning director of the City Planning Commission. Within a short time they submitted a unanimous report to the Board, which was adopted, setting forth the major, immediate problems facing Greater Cleveland, together with recommendations as to the action that the Council should take. As presented these problems are: Private Enterprise (in terms of those difficulties which it faces that must be solved in order to maintain high level and /or full employment in the postwar period); Needs of Returning Service Men; Labor-Management Relations; Extent of Postwar Labor Markets and Supply; Public Works; Housing and Blighted Areas; Transportation, Traffic and Transit; Education; Social and Cultural Services and Public Finance and Taxation. To this list has since been added the question of Interracial Relations.

At the present time panels have been appointed and are functioning in regard to Public Finance and Taxation; Transportation, Traffic and Transit; Public Works; Needs of Returning Service Men and Interracial Relations. Preliminary consideration has been given to the matter of Postwar Labor Markets and Supply. The panels on the other problems are in the process of formation. Their job is to get the facts, analyze them and then seek agreement upon an action policy that is in the best interest of the entire community. Note, if you will, that we have extended our interest beyond just physical planning.

Panels now formally functioning represent a total of 68 different citizens and average in size from 3 to 22. To this number should be added the members of the Board of Trustees who, either as the entire Board or the Executive Committee, have been meeting approximately every two weeks. Most of the panels meet regularly once a week.

Such is our philosophy. Such is our approach. The test that all men face is to make their action match their philosophy. While the future holds the answer we can, in the meantime, find profit in exchanging our experiences. The real danger we face is whether we are moving too slowly and too timidly. Psychologically we are working at the high tide of opportunity. Let it not ebb before we have established a beachhead.

Postwar Programs and Citizens Support

EDWARD CONNOR, Executive Director, Citizens Housing and Planning Council of Detroit, Mich.

JUST seven months ago today (November 15, 1943), I started work on my present assignment as Executive Director of the Citizens Housing and Planning Council of Detroit. This makes me probably the newest Rookie in this conference—or perhaps I should say, for me at least, this training school. In any event, if I am not the newest, I want you to know that I am probably the greenest. So you can understand me when I say that I came to this conference to learn and to get help.

So I am not going to tell you about Detroit's problems. Suffice it to say here that we probably have all the problems of any good-sized city in the country—only more so. Nor am I going to attempt to tell you of our postwar plans as we have developed them so far. But rather I am going to devote my few minutes here to the last half of the title of this program, Citizens Support, and raise some questions concerning that on which I feel the need for help.

Now what is *Citizens Support?* At every conference I attend I hear speaker after speaker say it is something that is needed. In fact even speakers who do not seem to agree on much else when talking about the same subject, seem to agree on this. Does Citizens Support merely mean that the citizen accepts the plan developed by the expert? Or is what is meant by Citizens Support just a way of expressing the hope that after the planning is done and the facilities created, John Doakes is going to decide they are worth while, and decide to use them?

Let me raise this question in another way. When do we want this support from Mr. Citizen? Is it after the expert has finished his job of planning? Or is it in election years only? Or is it, when we, the planners, get into trouble and are in difficulty?

Now to some of you, these may seem like academic questions, but let me assure you they are very real and the list could be greatly expanded. Questions on who do we mean by citizens? How is support to be expressed? And a host of others could be included. These questions have come to me out of a very brief experience representing a citizens organization and can be duplicated I am sure, by anyone in a similar position.

It seems to me at this point that what we really must mean by Citizens Support is citizen participation—participation of all our people in analyzing, planning and executing the plans. What we mean and what we desire—what we must have—is a total attack on all our common problems, by all of us—a total mobilization for a total victory over our problems after the war as well as during the war. It means mobilizing and using our total mind power as a community and as a Nation, as well as our muscle power, and our money power. There is a lot of *know-how* in

America, and it is not the exclusive attribute of any group, as we have seen during the war. We need this *know-how* in the peace as well.

The point can perhaps be best stated in terms of analogy. Our cities composed of people are sick, and we are calling in the Doctor—the expert. Now the Doctor needs the help of the patient in finding the trouble and in diagnosing it. And the patient must agree with the prescription or it will only make him sicker. It is a joint endeavor throughout the process and so it must be with city planning. In this I think we will all agree. But I think we would agree further that we do not have this widespread participation. Why not? I think there are a number of reasons. I would like to offer a few:

1. *It is a postwar program.* In other words it is to many tomorrow's problem and tomorrow's program. Sure, I know we cannot build now and I am not suggesting that we take time or energy from the war effort, but I cannot help pointing out that we have built thousands and thousands of houses during this war period and practically all without regard to modern principles of city or community planning, making our problem bigger, even as we plan—building tomorrow's slums now. Our people must wonder whether we really mean it. Life is a steady stream—not a succession of unrelated events. The people must be brought into the planning process now, and today must be related to tomorrow, if our people are going to feel and grasp the importance of this planning we are doing.

2. *The over-emphasis in a sense on the Master Plan ideal.* The Master Plan too often is being thought of as the final answer, but I believe a Master Plan is the beginning and not the end of the planning process. If it is the final, complete and conclusive answer, then we can act only on certainties. It becomes a little frightening; we cannot afford a mistake. But if it is only the beginning, then we are free to act on the probabilities. And the average citizen is more willing to participate.

3. *The priority listings in which single projects are listed in terms of kind of construction.* This confuses, it seems to me. It divides support. Who is to say which is most important—housing, or civic center, or parks, etc.? The effort to do so only antagonizes—priorities should be groups of projects and include some in each area of service. Then all citizens can unite in terms of the whole plan.

4. *The heavy emphasis on facilities and not on service.* If facilities are the purpose of planning, then of course, planning becomes the exclusive playground of the architect, the engineer and the builder, and the average citizen has difficulty in participating. If the building merely houses a service, meeting the needs, interests and desires of people—the living requirements of people—then the emphasis should be on service. Then we are not so likely to overbuild or under-build—or build for building's sake. Our planning will include provisions for staffing these facilities and maintaining them. And all trades and all professions—every one has something to contribute to the program.

Other factors that hinder our ability to mobilize all of our citizens in a common attack on our problems could be listed, of course. City instead of area planning, the controversy over public housing and others, could be included. But now, I would like to suggest some tools that are needed if the citizen is to be interested in the problem and help to make his contribution:

1. Simple, understandable statement of the problem, questions involved and proposed solutions are needed. The usual report or plan is difficult even for the expert to understand. Newspapers too often highlight different aspects of the same plan so that it almost appears that they are talking about two different things. Can we work out a simple formula for presenting our plans to the public, something like this?

(a) A simple definition of the project—what is it, how much does it cost—how many months of labor will it be?

(b) What will it accomplish? Or stated differently, what poor present conditions will it correct?

(c) What are some of the problems involved and not yet answered? Financing will appear often in this listing. But let us tell the people frankly what the unanswered questions are and not let them become disillusioned later when they run into them unexpectedly.

(d) A listing of the arguments for the project and the arguments against it. In a democracy, we trust the judgment of the common man—let us give him the opportunity of choice.

(e) A listing of resource material.

(f) The names, titles, addresses and telephone numbers of the parties responsible for planning the project and for carrying it out.

2. Simple frameworks of reference on such things as standards of recreation, transportation, etc. are needed. What should any good city recreation plan contain? What age groups should it serve? What type of facilities should it contain? What space requirements must be met? Without this framework too often the citizen is merely reacting to a pretty picture, or the reputation of the planner, or for some other reason apart from the real value of the plan or project.

3. A citizen's work book or hand book on City Planning is needed.

4. Housing and Planning Committees are needed in every organization. The Medical Association, the Bar Association, Social Workers, Engineers, and all the rest have an interest in these fields and a contribution to make.

5. More thinking and planning is needed at the neighborhood level, and mechanics who bring this about, need development.

And finally, I know this list is very incomplete, but let me add one more—a national organization, perhaps a department in the American Planning and Civic Association is needed through which citizen organizations like the one I work for can pool ideas and exchange experiences on this most important aspect of planning—Citizens Support.

In closing, let me say that while the problem is great, I have every confidence in our ability in America to meet it. I know people are interested and concerned with the postwar period, and with the problems of our cities. I know with their help, the problems will be solved—and I appreciate that this Rookie, myself, has a chance to play in the game.

Postwar Program and Citizens Support—Niagara Frontier

BERTRAM D. TALLAMY, Chief Engineer, Niagara Frontier Planning Board, Buffalo, N. Y.

AS YOU may judge, the subject of postwar planning and citizens support as it relates to the Niagara Frontier of Western New York has many ramifications. So many, in fact, that it is quite impossible adequately to cover the subject in the time available this afternoon. It is necessary, therefore, for me to confine my remarks to a brief description of:

1. Our regional postwar problem.
2. The plan for attacking it.
3. The composition of our Official Board and of the Niagara Frontier Planning Association.
4. Their part in the overall postwar planning program.
5. What is actually being done now.

The *Niagara Frontier* is that portion of Western New York bordering the Niagara River, comprising Erie and Niagara Counties. Buffalo and Niagara Falls are the two major cities. It is at the foot of Lake Erie and the upper Great Lakes system. It is located at the westerly end of the New York State Barge Canal, which waterway extends all the way across the State to the Hudson River on the east, and provides a route for waterborne traffic between the Niagara district, Albany and New York.

The great eastern railroad systems focus on the Western New York Niagara district and furnish highspeed overnight transportation to our great eastern seaboard cities. These and other roads also furnish overnight service to Saint Louis, Chicago and areas within that range. Because of the lake, canal, rail and equally good highway service, the Niagara Frontier has become one of the country's greatest commercial centers.

The land in that section of the country is relatively flat; cheap hydroelectric power is available from Niagara Falls developments; the climate is good, and a large reservoir of diversified skilled labor is available. Raw materials from the various sections of the country flow easily to Western New York. It is in the center of a great market. As a result, a gigantic producer-goods industry has developed there; steel, chemicals, automobiles, engines, shipbuilding, flour milling, cereal production and aviation are but a few.

The aviation industry alone now employs some 80,000 in the production of fighting ships and their accessories. This industry and the rehabilitation of men in the armed forces presents a colossal postwar employment problem. According to the best estimates that the Niagara Frontier Planning Board has been able to secure, 15 to 20 percent of the

present aircraft industrial production will be more than adequate to meet the postwar demands for private, commercial and military aircraft production, and these figures are based upon the assumption that all first-class mail will be air mail, that most Pullman travel will be air travel and that a vast increase in the use of private planes will be experienced. If these estimates prove correct, at least 80 percent of the 80,000 or 64,000 people, now directly employed in the production of airplanes and parts in the Niagara district, will lose their jobs.

It is true that some of them are over-age and will retire from active employment, while others are women who will go back to their homes; still others are immigrants who will return to their original homes. However, if only half of all these would require new employment after the war (and certainly that is a conservative estimate), 32,000 people formerly employed in the aircraft industry would be seeking and need new employment. These, added to the 75,000 men from the Niagara Frontier presently in the armed forces, indicates the extent of the postwar employment problem. Over 100,000 persons without any consideration of the many who will lose their employment as the result of reduction in activity in other industries will need new work.

The Niagara Frontier Planning Board recognizes the axiomatic principle in this country that the bulk of employment must be private employment if we are to preserve what we call our American way of life and standard of living, and that this principle is recognized by a majority in all walks of life. It appreciates that should men returned from our armed forces be unable to secure jobs in private industry, and should heads of families be unable to secure a sufficient income from private industry to maintain a decent standard of living, they will take the situation into their own hands, so to speak, and through their Government take over private enterprise or at least drastically regulate its activities, irrespective of the fact that by so doing it will have a disastrous long-term effect upon our national democratic form of government and free enterprise.

As a result of this full realization, the Niagara Frontier Planning Board coöperates to the fullest extent with such agencies as are intimately concerned with the private enterprise phase of postwar planning.

Some of these agencies working in the Niagara district and, I may say, doing a good job, are:

1. The national, regional, and county chapters of the Committee for Economic Development.
2. Buffalo Chamber of Commerce.
3. The Niagara Falls Chamber of Commerce.
4. New York State Department of Commerce, which official body has recently established a Niagara Frontier office which is devoting its full time to that purpose.

The ramifications of the private enterprise phase of the over-all post-

war problem is so great, however, that it is absolutely beyond the ability of man to comprehend within narrow limitations the results of his plan. Therefore, it is necessary to provide a factor of safety. The engineer, in the design of structures is competent to determine the stresses which each member of the structure will be required to carry, and he knows the strength of the materials of which each member will be constructed. Nevertheless, he uses a factor of safety. Certainly, when we are planning anything so important as the future economy of this country, we cannot fail to provide such a factor.

The Niagara Frontier Planning Board believes that this includes, among other things, a backlog of carefully considered, worthwhile public works planned in detail and ready to be placed under construction upon short notice, so that we will never again be forced into a hastily conceived make-shift plan.

Because of the very nature of the Niagara Frontier Planning Board work, it is the public works phase of the over-all postwar planning problem with which the Board is most intimately connected.

Our Board was established by an Act of the State of the New York Legislature in 1925, and I might add was the first regional Planning Board to be organized under state legislation in the country. As I stated before, the Niagara Frontier is comprised of the Erie and Niagara County areas of Western New York; this includes six cities: Buffalo, Lackawanna and Tonawanda in Erie County, and Niagara Falls, North Tonawanda and Lockport in Niagara County. By virtue of his office, the Mayor of each city is a member of the Niagara Frontier Planning Board.

In New York State the county legislative bodies are Boards of Supervisors. The respective chairmen of the Erie County Board of Supervisors and the Niagara County Board of Supervisors each appoint three of their Board members to the Niagara Frontier Planning Board. These 12 men, the six Mayors and the six Supervisors, at their annual meeting, select a thirteenth man to serve as chairman. The legally established membership of the Niagara Frontier Planning Board assures an intimate liaison between the Planning Board and the major political subdivisions of the area.

In developing a postwar public works program, the Board has divided the type of work into two principal classifications:

1. Those projects which are indispensable for the health and welfare of the people.
2. Those public works which are not necessary to a static community but which are indispensable to a growing community, determined to offer ever expanding opportunity and better living to its residents.

Under the first group are listed public works which have been deferred because of material and labor shortages during the war. They are so urgently needed it may become necessary for many of them to be under-

taken before an extensive public works program becomes necessary to supplement private enterprise in order to maintain employment.

The second classification is subdivided into four groups:

(a) Public works which open up new horizons for the development of our commerce and industry.
(b) Those which directly improve local living standards, such as public and private housing, urban rehabilitation.
(c) Projects which will result in a fuller, more satisfactory public service at the same or reduced cost—consolidations of special districts.
(d) Public works which add to the pleasure and satisfaction of living and conducting business in the Niagara area—parks, parkways, libraries, museums, etc.

Regional public works sponsored by the Planning Board fall definitely into these several classifications. One has recently been approved and adopted by the State of New York. It provides for the construction of an express highway along the Niagara Frontier waterfront extending from Niagara Falls on the north, southerly through Buffalo, Lackawanna and the town of Hamburg. There it will join the State Thruway system, a part of the interregional express highway project. Another undertaking now under study by the Niagara Frontier Planning Board would provide for the development of a regional airport after the war, and still another for the consolidation of 69 special water supply districts into one metropolitan system.

The Niagara Frontier Planning Board confines its own public works planning to those of a regional character. Purely local projects are planned and promoted by the individual localities. However, the Niagara Frontier Planning Board does urge each community within Erie and Niagara Counties to prepare a public works program of its own, to supplement the regional program and, in so doing, to consider carefully all of the financial aspects of each project, balancing costs with ability to finance and maintain.

During the course of years, the Niagara Frontier Planning Board has adopted three principal methods of maintaining and establishing public relations. These are:

1. Direct publicity by means of interviews, formal newspaper releases, radio, the delivery of speeches, and the holding of public meetings on special occasions.

2. Indirect publicity resulting through the enlistment of local community assistance in the development of regional plans. Local Zoning and Planning Boards have an intimate interest in practically all regional projects. The Niagara Frontier Planning Board meets with these local boards as occasion demands, enlists their support, requests their advice, and in many instances, their active participation in the development of the regional plan insofar as it pertains to the local community. This collaboration results in amicable relations, and more often than not, publicity through local sources.

3. Partnership with the Niagara Frontier Planning Association—a wholly unofficial planning organization interested in regional planning.

The Niagara Frontier Planning Association was the sponsor of the Niagara Frontier Planning Board. You may be interested in that history.

The Association was organized in 1924 by a group of public-spirited citizens of Erie and Niagara Counties, New York, who recognized the necessity for planning on a regional basis. After a series of meetings and a rather extensive public education program, the then Governor Alfred E. Smith and leaders of the New York State Legislature became interested in the idea of a regional planning body. Within a short time legislation for the establishment of the Niagara Frontier Planning Board had been drafted and submitted to the Legislature. It was promptly passed and approved by the Governor.

Since that time the Niagara Frontier Planning Association, now an organization of some 300 Niagara Frontier citizens, and the official Board have been working together. Frequently the directors of the Association meet with the official Board to discuss current problems, and the entire membership of the Association meets with the Board once or twice a year, usually at a dinner or banquet. Such intimate collaboration between official and private groups interested in the same cause—regional planning—has proved a most effective means of education, public relations generally, and for the advancement of regional projects.

In closing, may I add my personal views as to rules for maintaining successful public relations. A Planning Board ought never to step out of character. It ought to complete at least one definite, worthwhile undertaking each year. It ought to collaborate with other public and private agencies. Above all, it ought be realistic!

INDEX

Adams, Thos., xiv.
Agricultural Extension Service, 9.
Agriculture, Dept. of, 10.
Alabama State Parks, 97.
Albright, Horace M., ix-xv, xvii.
AlleyDwelling Authority, Washington, 93.
Am. Civic Assn., ix, x, xi, xiii, xvi, xvii.
Am. League for Civic Imp., ix.
Am. Park and Outdoor Art Society, ix, xvi.
Am. Planning and Civic Annual, xv.
Am. Planning and Civic Assn., xi, xvi, xviii, 13, 19, 22, 61, 71, 170.
Am. Soc. of Civil Eng., 140.
Assn. of Am. Railroads, 141.

Baltimore, 92.
Barker, Henry A., xiv.
Bartholomew Harland, xiv, xv, 48, 112–115.
Bassett, Edward M., xiv, xv.
Bettman, Alfred, xv, 51–61.
Biddle, Mrs. Edward, xiv.
Black, H. C., 103.
Boardman, Sam H., 106.
Bratton, Milford, 106.
Bromfield, Louis, xiv, 1–7.
Bryce, James, xiv, xvi.
Buffalo, 172.
Bumpus, Herman C., xiv.
Burnham, Daniel H., xiv, 125.
Burns, E. L., 107.
Burton, Theodore, xiv.
Burt, Struthers, xiv.

California State Parks, 97.
Canada Pacific Railway, 142.
Chicago, ix, x, 140, 143.
Childress, L. Wade, 112.
Cincinnati, 22, 92, 125, 127, 140.
Clark, Irving W., 84.
Cleveland, O., xvi, 92, 163–167.
Cobb, Irving, 37.
Conference of Governments, x, xiii.
Connor, Edward, 168–170.
Coolidge, Pres. Calvin, xiv.
Crawford, Frederick C., 31–40.
Cuyahoga Co., 164.

Dallas, Texas, x, 120, 140, 143.
Dana, Marshall, xiv.
Darling, "Ding," xiv.
Davis, Chester C., 116–17.
Davis, Lionberger, xv.
Dealey, Geo. B., xiii, xiv.
Delano, Frederic A., xiv, xvi, xviii, 48.
Denver, 140.
Dermitt, Miss H. M., xiv.
Detroit, 168–170.
DeTurk, Chas., 99.
Dill, Malcolm, 125–130.
Dodd, Harold W., xiv.
Draper, Earle S., xiv.
Drinker, Henry S., xiv.
Drury, Newton B., 22–27.

Eastman, Joseph, 137.
Evans, James F., 104.
Evans, Robert M., 146.

Fairbank, H. S., 44–51.
Falmouth, Ky., 21.
Fed. Public Housing Auth., 86–90.
Fed. Works Agency, 40–43.
Fleming, Maj. Gen. Philip B., 40–43.
Flickinger, V. W., 100.
Florida State Parks, 97.
Ford, Geo. B., xiv, xv.
Ford, Henry, 16.
Fortune, 157.
Fort Worth, Texas, 143.
Foulke, Wm. Dudley, xiv.

Gadsby, J. H., 107.
Gale, Zona, xiv.
Garfield, Abram, xiv.
Gellhorn, Mrs. Geo., xv.
George Com. on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, 76.
Georgia State Parks, 97.
Giannini, A. P., xiv.
Gillette, Edgar L., 101.
Glenn, John M., xiv.
Gordon, Chas., 130–136.
Gould, Carl, xiv.
Grant, Maj. Gen. U. S. 3d, 91–96.
Great Falls of Potomac, 19.
Greer, Guy, 156–162.
Gregg, Wm. C., xiv.
Gries, Jno. M., xiv.
Griffith, R. B., 110.
Groves, Harold M., 65.
Gulick, Dr. Luther, 65.

Hamlin, Chauncey J., xiv.
Harding, Pres. Warren, xiv.
Harrisburg, Pa., xiii.
Harrison, R. Ward, 97.
Hart, Albert Bushnell, xiv.
Hay, Wm. H., 108.
Heights of Bldgs. Commn., x.
Heller, Walter W., 61–71.
Henning, A. E., 97.
Henry, Patrick, 9.
Herlihy, Elisabeth, xiv.
Hetch–Hetchy, xiii.
Hilbun, Bura, 102.
Holden, Thos. S., 72–79.
Hoover, Pres. Herbert, xiv.
Howland, Wm. B., xiv.
Hubbard, Henry V., xiv.
Hughes, Chas. Evans, xvii, 60.
Hull, Morton D., xiv.

Ihlder, John, xiv, 80–86.

Illinois Farm Economics, 12.
Illinois State Parks, 98.
Indiana State Parks, 99.
Indianapolis, 140, 151.
Iowa State Parks, 100.
Izaak Walton League, 22.

Jackson Hole National Monument, xii, 20, 21, 22, 28–30.
James, Harlean, xiv.
Johnson, Mayor Tom, xiv.
Johnson, Dr. O. R., 13–19.
Jonah, Col. Frank, 137.
Jusserand, Jules J., xiv.

Kansas City, 140, 143.
Kaufmann, Mayor A. P., xv, 111–115.
Kelsey, Harlan P., xiv.
Kessler, Geo., ix, xiv, xvii.
Kingscott, W. J., 102.
Kizer, Ben H., xiv.
Klutznick, Philip M., 86–90.
Knowles, Morris, xiv.
Kuntz, Dr. Geo. F., xiii.

Lane, Franklin K., xvii.
Lathrop, Harold, 102.
Lawrence, E. F., xv.
Lee, Joseph, xiv.
Lewis, Nelson P., xiv, xv.
Lieber, Richard, xiv.
Lindsay, Frank, xiv.
Louisiana State Parks, 100.
Lowden, Gov. Frank, Home, 98.

MacDonald, Thos., 50.
MacVeagh, Franklin, xiii, xiv.
Manning, Warren H., xiv, xvi.
Massachusetts State Parks, 101.
Mather, Stephen T., xiv.
Mather, Wm. G., xiv.
McCormick, Vance, xiii, xiv, xviii.
McFarland, Dr. J. Horace, xiii, xiv, xv, xvi–xviii.
McMillan Report on Washington, ix.
Miami Watershed, 1.
Michigan State Parks, 102.
Milwaukee, 92.
Minnesota State Parks, 102.
Mississippi Basin, 6.
Mississippi State Parks, 102.
Missouri, Home Rule, 160.
Missouri River Watershed, 5.
Muir, John, xiii.
Muskingum Watershed, 1, 2, 3, 6.

Nat. Assn. of Home Builders, 85.
Nat. Capital Housing Authority, 93.
Nat. Capital, Joint Com. on, 96.
Nat. Capital Park and Planning Commn., xi, xiv, 91, 93, 95.
Nat. Conference on City Planning, x, xv.
Nat. Conference on State Parks, 19
Nat. Parks, x, 22–27.
Nat. Park Service, x, 22, 23, 24.
Nat. Resources Planning Bd., xi, xiv.
Nevada State Parks, 103.
Newcomer, Mabel, 65.
New Hampshire, 110.
New Jersey State Parks, 103.
New Orleans, 92.
New York State Parks, 104.
Niagara Falls, xvii.
Niagara Frontier, 171–175.
Noland, Stephen C., 151–155.
Nolen, John, xiv, xv.
North Carolina State Parks, 104.
North Dakota State Parks, 105.

Office of Defense Transportation, 144.
Ohio River, 3.
Ohio State Parks, 105.
Oklahoma City, 143.
Oklahoma State Parks, 106.
Olmsted, Frederick Law, xiii, xiv, xv.
Oregon State Parks, 106.

Parks, Oliver, 145–6.
Payne, John Barton, xiv.
Peabody, Geo. Foster, xiii, xiv.
Pearse, R. J., 104.
Pennsylvania State Parks, 106.
Prentice, E. Parmalee, 7.
Planning and Civic Comment, xii.
Purdy, Lawson, xiv, xv.

Quinn, Frank D., 108.

Reed, Thos. H., 63.
Reid, Russell, 105.
Robinson, Chas. Mulford, xiv.
Rodgers, Mayor J. Woodall, 117–125.
Roosevelt, Pres. Franklin D., xiv, 28–30.
Roosevelt, Mrs. Franklin D., xiv.
Roosevelt, Nicholas, xiv.
Roosevelt, Pres. Theodore, x, xi, xiv, xvii.
Root, Elihu, xvi.
Rusk, Dean H. P., 7–13.
Russell, E. J., xv.
Saint Louis, ix, xiii, xv, xvii, 82, 111–115, 140, 145–6.
Sargent, Dr. Chas. S., xiii, xiv.
Scoggin, Lewis, 97.
Segrest, James L., 97.
Shaw, Albert, xiv.
Shurtleff, Flavel, xvi.
Simon, Robert G., 109.
Smith, Gov. Alfred E., 175.
Soil Conservation Service, xii, 7–13.
South Carolina State Parks, 107.
South Dakota State Parks, 107.
State Parks, 97–110.
Stauffer, Donald, 106.
Syracuse, 156.

Taft, Lorado, xiv, 98.
Taft, Pres. Wm. H., xiv.
Tallamy, Bertram, 171–175.
Taylor, Graham Romeyn, xiv.
Tennessee State Parks, 108.
Tennessee Valley Authority, 1, 3, 6.
Thurman, Eleanor, xiv.
Tilton, L. Deming, xiv.
Texas State Parks, 108.

Tobey, Russell B., 110.
Tulsa, 143.

Vermont State Parks, 109.
Virginia State Parks, 109.

Wacker, Chas., xiv.
Wallace, John F., 140.
Wallace, Tom, 19–22
Washington, D. C., ix, xii, 91–96, 140.
Watrous, Richard B., xiv, xvii, xviii.
Waugh, Frank A., xiv.
Wells, Wm. W., 100.
Weston, S. Burns, 163–167
West Virginia State Parks, 110.
Wheelock, W. R., 105.
Whitten, Robert, xiv.
Williams, Geo. W., 98.
Wilson, Pres. Woodrow, xiv.
Woodruff, C. R., xiv.
Wright, Warren, 109.

Yellowstone National Park, 23.

Zueblin, Chas., xiv, xvi.